The Christian Way of Liberty

John A. W. Haas

Presented by
Harry Zeeh

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/christianwayofli0000john

THE CHRISTIAN WAY OF LIBERTY

OTHER BOOKS BY DR. HAAS

Freedom and Christian Truth

The Unity of Faith and Knowledge

The Problem of the Christian State

In the Light of Faith

The Truth of Faith

What Ought I to Believe

THE CHRISTIAN WAY OF LIBERTY

BY

JOHN A. W. HAAS

D.D. (Thiel College), LL.D. (University of Pennsylvania, Augustana College, Gettysburg College)

President of Muhlenberg College; Member of Author's Club, London

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
12024 BV
234
741
H112
.H22
1930

PHILADELPHIA : PENNSYLVANIA
THE UNITED LUTHERAN PUBLICATION HOUSE

COPYRIGHT, 1930, BY
THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF
THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

MADE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	7
Introduction	9
PART I	
The Author of Liberty	19
Chapter I—The Free God	21
Chapter II—The Free Creator	37
Chapter III—The Free Sustainer	53
PART II	
Man's Loss of Liberty	69
Chapter IV—Man's State Before the Loss	71
Chapter V—The Cause of the Loss	87
Chapter VI—The Consequences of the Loss	104
PART III	
The Restoration of Liberty	119
Chapter VII—Christ, the Restorer	121
Chapter VIII—The Work of Restoration	135
Chapter IX—The Results of Restoration	151
PART IV	
The Growth of Liberty	167
Chapter X—In the Individual	169
Chapter XI—The Fellowship of Freedom	184
Chapter XII—The Fulfillment of Freedom	200

PREFACE

To think God's thoughts after Him has often been used to characterize our human efforts to interpret nature. This same idea can mark the attempts to present the truth of revelation. Such a task has been undertaken in this volume.

It endeavors to prove the contention that Christianity has the ultimate solution for the problem of liberty in the New Testament principles. The spiritual source of final freedom is sought through and in Christ Who can make us free.

Lakehurst, N. J.
December, 1929.

J. H.

"It was through Christianity that the idea that the human being is actually free came into the world."—Hegel, *Philosophy of Mind.*

"None can love freedom heartily but good men: the rest love not freedom, but license."—Milton, *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates.*

INTRODUCTION

In every period of history that begins a new era it is necessary that Christianity take account of itself and ascertain how it may use new ideas and trends of thought and feeling, or how it must correct them. Christianity is not merely a historical movement, but in large measure a body of truth and an assemblage of convictions. These find their original and pure expression in the historically approved record of revelation of the New Testament. But the first messages must be assimilated and interpreted ever anew. In such interpretation it is essential that the prevailing conceptions of an age should be used to bring the truth of Christianity home to men in the thought and language in which they move and have their being. But very often there is one great, outstanding ideal, one ruling emotion, which characterizes an age.

In our times with all the varieties of feeling, and all the shades of thought, the question may arise whether we are moved by any one strong ideal. But amid the confusion of thought and the Babel of voices, we may hear one cry underneath all vociferation if we listen carefully. It is the cry for liberty. In our thinking and feeling we are more and more coming to ask, "What is

true freedom?'' Back of political, or social, or economic liberty lie great fundamental moral and spiritual considerations. The problem is not the simple one of the free will, difficult though this may be in some aspects. We shall never come closer to a solution if we do not approach it fundamentally. In this approach Christianity offers itself as pointing the way to true liberty.

We must attack this question of freedom for the sake of our youth. There is a new attitude of independence which animates the young people of today. They confuse independence with liberty, and in the identification of independence and freedom they run off the track. Their independence is often uncontrolled individualism, and they do not realize in how many ways they are and must be dependent in the human society in which they live. Although they boast of this age as scientific they are not consistent in knowing and feeling how they are hemmed in by the processes of nature. They forget also that there are spiritual realities and contacts, which cannot be so easily set aside, and that there is religion for which they must account. How foolish and thoughtless it is, therefore, to think, and feel, and say: ''I am master of my fate.'' In how far we are free, and what constitutes real, essential liberty must be carefully sought. In this seeking Christianity presents itself with a real message. There is a liberty of Christianity which is fundamental to all life.

It was in the Reformation of the sixteenth century that the liberty of Christianity was first stressed. During the whole prior ages there was no realization of the words of Jesus: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free (John 8:32) and "If the Son make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36). It came like a new revelation to the world when Martin Luther in 1520 issued his treatise on "The Liberty of the Christian Man." The discussion rests upon two principles: First, by faith man is a lord of all things and subject to none; second, by love he becomes the servant of all.

The lordship of faith was not understood by Luther in a psychological sense. He knew that faith is mighty, busy, strong, and had great effect and influence upon the life of men. But its true emancipating power was in its content, and this content was Christ. In our day men place the liberating power of faith upon belief as such, and not upon its truth. It has been found that New Thought, Christian Science, images of the Virgin Mary, the bones of St. Anne, the grave of a priest, —in short a variety of widely differing objects produce a certain limited curative effect. But this psychological effect of any belief does not fundamentally free man in his inner spirit and life. Often it creates dangerous delusions that harm both intellect and emotion, and pervert the reality of things.

Faith as Luther knew it gave a man through

Christ a real inner freedom and joy resting upon the fact that a soul was justified through Christ before God. He had ultimate liberty and peace. He needed no human intercessor for he was himself a spiritual priest. This joyous freedom was not brought into servitude by love. Love acts freely and without any trammels. It finds itself when it gives itself. The love of faith in Christ is not a passionate desire for possession. All bodily accompaniments of human, sexual love must be entirely eliminated in our estimate of love in religion. Bodily love enthralls, but religious love liberates. Therefore the two principles of Christian liberty enunciated by Luther actually state the basis of inner freedom which a Christian possesses.

But does the problem of liberty find its fullest expression simply in the liberty of a believing Christian? Is not the conception of Luther capable of wider application? These are the questions which are considered, and to which an answer is sought, in the chapters of this book. The claim is put forth that the whole body of essential Christian truth can be put under the idea of liberty. It is possible and fruitful to show that all doctrines held by a consistent and thoughtful Christian unfold the meaning of real liberty. The effort to delineate them in this manner will necessitate some speculative inferences derived from the simple Gospel. What the Gospel contains, and what it assumes from the religion of Israel,

is the starting point for thought in endeavoring to prove that Christianity is liberty.

If Christian thinking does not produce its philosophy, the secular philosophy will dominate in Christian men. There is too much of unchristian and antichristian thinking prevalent in the ideas of men who still claim to be Christian in their feelings and emotions. The present strong tendency toward a union of Christians often rests on mere sentiment, and is willing to surrender essential truth to satisfy an ideal which has captured the imagination. There is apparently in many minds a lack of the realization that a religion cannot live through sentiment alone. This defect hinders the application of the full Christian truth to the problems and ideas that it should solve. How lightly the average preaching skims over the surface. It arouses emotion, but it does not build character because it has no clear, consistent philosophy. No doubt some youths have been estranged from Christianity because they were not clearly shown what it meant. Consequently the philosophy of science or art was adopted, and Christianity, seen in a perverted light, did not offer the material for a Christian philosophy broad enough to include all the facts of life. Perhaps by showing how Christianity deals with liberty some minds will find a new appreciation of it.

There are some prevalent objections to the conception of religion, even in its Christian form,

as fostering and favoring liberty. Since the days of Schleiermacher his definition of religion as the feeling of absolute dependance upon God, has had a strong hold upon the minds of the psychologists and philosophers of religion. The question arises in how far the general acceptance of the definition of Schleiermacher is justified. To determine this query we must analyze the conception of the great German theologian.

Is religion primarily and fundamentally feeling? It is true that all religion has sentiment and emotion. There can be no worship without feeling. In some ways religion is akin to art. But this fact does not cover religion in its total concreteness. Many persons are religious with a minimum of feeling. The mind as well as action must take part in the religious life. Consequently religion means more than feeling, and it contains more within it than emotion. With different temperaments varying elements of religion predominate. Service distinguishes the faith of some persons, high intellection that of others. The intellect can never be debarred. But even for those who interpret religion for themselves as feeling it can well be the feeling of freedom.

Another part of Schleiermacher's definition is his accent upon the absolute dependance upon God. Admitting for the moment that religion is dependance, which we shall question, is this dependance necessarily absolute (*schlechthinnig*)? If God's power and sovereignty are strongly

stressed man will feel His control to be absolute. But the freedom which God grants man does not justify the description of man's dependance upon God as absolute. It will appear as we proceed that the truer idea of religion does not make man such a helpless dependant upon God. Man does not hang so entirely upon the grace and mercy of God as to cancel his freedom.

The third question that we must put is, whether religion is essentially dependance Is man to be in abject reliance upon God? While it cannot be denied that in many ways we are dependent upon God, yet is this dependance the prominent and outstanding element of faith? The religion of a free man, in accordance with his highest destiny, has its reactions. We do not in our best and noblest religious attitudes and moods simply hang upon God, we come back at Him. The truer religion is rather a communion with God than a mere reliance. In Christ's proclamation of God as Father it is implied that we come as children to our Heavenly Father. There is a living and tender intercourse in spirit and act. In worship we not only receive from God, we also offer the sacrifices of praise and adoration. The conception of dependance as the essence of religion is slavish, and does not comport with the character of liberty that runs all through Christianity, as we shall endeavor to show.

The opposition to Christianity as freedom is not exhausted in the description of Schleier-

macher's attitude and that of his followers. There is a group of intellectualists who resent the Christian faith because it implies the masterhood of Christ. They desire to be captains of their own life. They will not have this Jesus to rule over them. The German philosopher Eucken, with all his appreciation of religion and Christianity, demanded the independence of his own mind and life from the domination of Christ. "How can Christianity be liberty with Christ so dominant in it?" ask these men. But there is a total misunderstanding of the masterhood of Christ on the part of these objectors. Christ does not take away our liberty, but establishes us in real freedom. He does not enslave us but draws us unto Him through His liberating love. We never find Him when on earth suppressing the personality of any one. The genuine faith in Christ even today exalts our individuality. No one who has companied with Christ intimately will ever accuse Him as the destroyer of liberty. His hold upon our soul is never tyrannical. All that He asks is our free acceptance of Him, and our voluntary following in His footsteps. The intellectualist objection to Jesus rests upon misapprehension, upon a lack of life with Christ and of the experience of the joy of inner freedom that comes from companying with Him.

There are more who reject Christianity as liberty because they contend that its truths and doctrines put a yoke upon the free thought and open

mind of man. Those, however, who accept Christ and His teaching do so freely. No one in this day is compelled to hold the Christian faith. It is utterly wrong to believe that any one who believes in Christ, and who by inheritance or choice accepts the doctrines of any church, is not intellectually as free in his beliefs as one who holds contrary views. In fact the informed and intelligent believer has a larger and broader outlook on all life than the non-believer. He does not reject any real and established truth in any sphere, but in addition he reaches out into spiritual realms of reality of which the unbeliever does not dream. An unbeliever surrenders the joy and liberty of the ideal world, and he does not understand the great peace and hope that lie in the liberty of the children of God.

In our day it has become fashionable in certain circles to be cynical about Christianity. The new religion proclaimed in popular magazines has little good to say of the Church. While other forms of social life have greater defects, and while the Church is still the sustaining power for righteousness, it is represented as having outlived its usefulness. There is a bias which does not weigh the facts justly. There are many who really have not examined the truths of Christianity carefully, but who taking their cue from the magazines decry these truths. A great majority of objectors to Christianity are very superficial, and rest their objections upon un-

proven assertions. Prejudice largely rules. Men follow the lead of certain novelists and writers whose facile pen overcomes their knowledge.

A common conception is that this is a scientific age, and that science is the liberator of man. The arguments produced mostly deal with the material world, and with man's outward creature comforts. The mental emancipation of science does not touch man's soul. It does not solve the problem of real inner freedom and liberty of the spirit. By its very nature it cannot do this. And those who deny the inner life because they have stifled it admit no evidence that deals with religious belief and experience. Very few people have a right to speak with authority about science. They only repeat partial and popularized theories which are often quite defective. There is no appreciation of the real spirit of scientific men like Pupin and Millikan, and many others. A genuine scientist knows how hypothetical many scientific theories are. He only accepts them provisionally. He distinguishes between the world of fact and the world of inference. Therefore he is willing to allow the speculative efforts of Christian thought, and does not rule them out. There is a real world of ideality which Christianity presents in its highest form. The fact that some men do not sense it does not do away with it.

PART I

THE AUTHOR OF LIBERTY

THE CHRISTIAN WAY OF LIBERTY

CHAPTER I

The Free God

At first sight it may seem a very unnecessary and superfluous proceeding to attempt to show that God is free. Does not His supreme will, His sovereignty and rule, His might and power amply imply His absoluteness? And if God is absolute, He is free. Perhaps liberty is too human a term to apply to God. And yet it is not improper to ascribe freedom to God from Whom all real freedom comes. Liberty does not appear only from man to man, and from God to man, but it is also the essential element in the nature and being of God. But not all conceptions and ideas of God allow Him to be free. Within certain so-called Christian interpretations of God, as well as in the non-Christian conceptions, liberty in its essential spiritual sense is not ascribed to God. It is the

mark of true Christianity imbibing the spirit of the New Testament to explain God, as far as human thought can endeavor to do so, from the angle of liberty.

In order to find the central idea of the free God we must start from the New Testament terms applied to Him. Jesus calls God spirit. This is no metaphysical definition. It arises out of the practical question of worship. When the Samaritan woman (John 4) inquires whether God is to be prayed to on Mt. Gerizim or in Jerusalem, she is not raising a quibbling query. In accord with the ancient idea of the gods she thinks that God is materially localized. The correction of Jesus when He calls God spirit, opposes the pagan localization by the assertion of God's universal presence as spirit. Therefore worship must be in spirit and truth. It is not a matter of locality, temple, or rite.

But while Jesus is not dealing with a philosophic problem, it is still true that spirit in some sense is free. It stands in contrast to matter. Matter in its operations and processes, even according to the latest hypotheses about it, is subject to necessity. Spirit is self-existent and self-controlled. It is its own cause and is altogether *sui generis*. While it may have regularities of procedure it is not under any compelling law. As far as there is a law of the spirit, the spirit makes its own law.

It has been objected that spirit is an impossible

conception and that men in imagination materialize it. Haeckel in his atheistical, cynical mood called God as spirit a gaseous vertebrate. It is true that the spirit is mysterious, and that it remains in large part an unexplored idea. The ancients named it etymologically after the wind, for they had the human breath in mind as evidence of the human spirit or soul. But there is a real analogy which Jesus asserts, when in His conversation with Nicodemus He says: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8).

The mystery of the spirit does not destroy its actuality. When the famous physicist Millikan in a lecture spoke of the spirit he was asked to define spirit. He retorted at once and asked the inquirer to define matter. Matter as thought of today is as mysterious as spirit. While human investigations have approached nearer to the mysteries of matter than of spirit this does not show that the mysteries of spirit are altogether unapproachable. They will never be found by the modern behavioristic psychology with its crude explanations of mind. But there is even now a clue to them in the spiritual experiences of believers as they have been indicated in the New Testament.

The conception of the spirit contains within it many of the attributes ascribed to God. They

can be deduced in unfolding the implications of spirit. In the Middle Ages the approach was different. It came through what was known as the negative theology, which is altogether different from the modern term "negative theology." The limitations of man were negatived to arrive at the unlimited attributes of God. Thus the finite became the infinite, the relative the absolute, the bounded power almightiness, the spacial limit omnipresence, the imperfect knowledge omniscience, and the temporal the eternal. But this method by contrast and opposition has no real guarantee. It is too purely speculative and without an adequate foundation. On the contrary the unfoldment of the idea of spirit has a basis for the deduction of the attributes of God.

As a spirit God is infinite because spirit in its fullest sense is not limited. The infinity of spirit is no quantitative conception, and has none of the defects of passing from the human finite to the divine infinite. It covers all that God is in His perfection as spirit. While infinite is not a scriptural but a philosophic word, it does not contradict the scriptural idea of God but interprets it in one direction. In the same manner God as absolute is thus because He is spirit. His absoluteness is not an indifferent totality, or an impersonal wholeness. It is the fulness of God in all His life. God, the spirit, as absolute is not shut out from entering the relative except by absorbing or overcoming relativity. In this con-

sists the divine freedom which is absent from all modern philosophic concepts of the absolute. In the same manner God as infinite can enter the finite in the liberty of His condescension and grace. Consequently the objection of Spinoza that the finite cannot contain the infinite (*finitum non est capax infiniti*), does not hold when God in His liberty as spirit enters the finite whether creatively or in redemption.

Spirit foresees and knows, and therefore in foreknowledge and absolute conception it covers everything. We cannot think of the infinite spirit and limit it in knowledge. Spirit would lose its meaning if it did not know, and the perfect, all-embracing spirit could not be such without omniscience. Consequently omniscience must belong to the infinite spirit if it be rightly conceived. In like manner the absolute spirit must be omnipresent. Such presence is not a vague spatial imagination in which we attempt either to remove all limits or to visualize an endless extension. Omnipresence is not both localized and non-localized. Because of the freedom inherent in spirit it may focalize locally without being spatial. The quality of the spirit must determine omnipresence in a spiritual and not in any material manner. Likewise the eternal is not the mere antithesis to the temporal. The temporal is bound up with flowing time. Eternity is not necessarily endless time, or time extended infinitely backward and forward. It has its own nature which is

above all timelessness. And yet the eternal in its liberty as spirit can enter into time, and can influence history. It is only through the conception of all these attributes as being in the liberty of the spirit that we can do justice to their meaning as applied to God.

But while spirit, as a true conception of the free God, is highly valuable it needs to be supplemented by other ideas of God. Through the development of modern philosophy spirit has lost its implication of liberty. Descartes, it is true, conceived of the primary substance in a theistic manner. Berkeley also made the mind as real substance when applied to God theistic. But Spinoza began the depersonalization of spirit. His substance "conceived through itself" is the equivalent of God. But in its absoluteness it loses real liberty and is impersonal. Hegel finds the climax of the logical evolution of the universe in spirit. But spirit with Hegel is not really free. Although he calls it the unique individual it is in reality not free. The followers of Hegel, and all absolutists in philosophic thinking, have emptied the spirit of its personal quality. They have identified it with a more or less colorless totality or wholeness. In view of this modern usage of spirit we must search further in the New Testament for a term which is unmistakably personal and admits freedom.

Jesus most frequently calls God "Father." He applies the fatherhood of God both to the disciples

as a group (Matt. 6:1), and also to the individual (Matt. 6:4, 6, 18). God is not merely "your" Father, but at the same time "thy" Father. God wants to be the Father of all men, but it is only through Christ that men can really apprehend God as their Father. When Jesus thus, through faith, led souls to God He used Father to mean "everything that is kind and wise in a human parent, caring both for grateful and ungrateful, giving not so much what was asked as what was salutary, but encouraging and calling for the confidence of his children."[1] But God could not be such a Father, and stand in personal relation to human beings, without dealing as a free God with men to whom He had given liberty. It is the idea of personality, when added to spirit through the usage of Father, that conserves the conception of a free God. The surrender of personality is the abandonment of liberty. For this reason intelligent lovers of ultimate liberty cannot give up the personal conception of God as spirit.

In the same prayer in which we come to God as "Our Father" we also pray "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10). This will, though good and gracious, is absolute. The almightiness of God is inherent in His will as it is action from God. However the all-power of God is the outcome of His free will. We dare not conceive of it as an impersonal force impelling

[1] Dr. Burkitt, "The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge," p. 218.

God. It is liable to be represented thus from the scientific angle of ultimate energy. God controls and uses His power freely and it does not master Him. It was misdevelopment when God's might as sovereignty was used by Augustine, and most logically by Calvin, in such a manner as to make divine freedom arbitrary. In the Augustinian and Calvinistic doctrine of predestination God uses His will and power for the saving of men, so that they are neither saved through their faith, nor really lost by their own guilt. The almighty sovereignty becomes immoral.

In his early treatise "On the Enslaved Will," Martin Luther also stresses grace, and the unfreedom of sinful man, to such a degree that God employs His grace absolutely over men. There is a fatalism which does injury to a justly free God, as well as to man in his formal free will. Fortunately Luther did not make this idea central. His doctrine of justification overcame it, although he never repudiated his strong emphasis on divine grace. The power of God's will if it is to remain free and good must not be overstressed.

Frequently Christ speaks of God as My Father, and also distinguishes between My Father and Your Father. This usage, and especially the baptismal formula, lead us to the consideration of God, spirit, in what the Church has defined as Trinity. It is very hard for the modern mind to accept the conception of the Ancient Church, when in the definition of the Trinity it speaks of one

substance and three persons. The modern use of substance makes it impersonal. It would reduce the idea of God to His nature as underlying personality seen in Father, Son and Spirit. The way is thus opened to absolutism and pantheism. The liberty of God is lost. To preserve the unity of God personality is reduced in value and meaning. It is evident that the stressing of three personalities may lead to tritheism unless counterbalanced by some bond of unity. The suggestion of Augustine, that we endeavor to approximate to the idea of one God in three persons through the Johannine conception of God as Love, is very valuable. If we take Love not impersonally but as the inner life of Father, Son and Spirit, and preserve the unity of God through the relation of the three personalities, rather than limit the personalities by the abstract unity of substance or love, we shall come closer to a solution. It is unfortunate also that the term "begotten"[2] to explain the relation of the Son to the Father, and "proceeding"[3] as defining the relation of the Spirit to the Father and to the Son, have been introduced through Greek thought. They savor too much of a process, and cannot be brought into real accord with the meaning of personality. It is true that the ancient sense of "person" is not

[2] "Only begotten" (John 1: 14) has the accent on only to which it is equivalent.

[3] "Proceedeth" (John 15: 26) is simply "goeth forth," and it does not have the coloring of the creedal and dogmatic "proceeding."

ours. We have enriched it in meaning, and have forgotten that in its origin it meant a mask. Consequently we are concerned with preserving the value of divine personality even if it comes through Father, Son and Spirit. The old usage injures the idea of a free God.

Out of the Love, which is God, as spirit, whether Father, Son or Spirit, but always a free personality, there arise many attributes of grace. Love is not an abstraction, or an ideal, apart from the living God. God is Love, and Love is God, and in its absolute completeness it dwells only in Him to inspire us to love (I John 4:8). The very usage of the New Testament marks the uniqueness of the Love that is God, and the love that comes from Him and is to return to Him. "It is somewhat remarkable that no absolutely clear instance of its use in profane Greek has been discovered; at the same time, it is so characteristic of the Biblical writings that it may be regarded as peculiar to them in the full sense which they have taught us to ascribe to it.'" Such love generates mercy, lovingkindness, forgiveness, grace, and all those attributes in which the divine personality leads men to the free life of goodness.

It is also remarkable that righteousness mostly is not the justice which frees the good and condemns the wicked. It is that quality of love by which God is "just and the justifier of him which

---

[4] Dr. Milligan, "History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge," p. 288.

believeth in Jesus'' (Romans 3:26), and by which ''if we confess our sins, he is faithful and *just* to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness'' (I John 1:9). It is that relation of God to man by which the right is established, not through punishment, but through rescuing love conditioned by man's readiness to accept it. Through this advancing idea of the New Testament God ceases to deal with men through severe justice. And unless we go beyond the New Testament and reduce God simply to the terms of our own experience we cannot be accused of changing the faith. But this personal God is not the modernist God, of Whom it has been well said, that He ''is not the God of the ancient faith. This is not God the Father, the Lawgiver, the Judge.''[5]

Parallel to this quality of God's righteousness is His holiness. The holiness of God is not a contradiction of His love, and it is not the aloofness and the aboveness of God in reference to man and the world. There is in it nothing hard, unbending, and severe as opposed to love. The loving God is holy, because without holiness He could neither be, nor show, liberating love. Divine love is not a sentimental affection which condones the evil that enslaves. It sanctifies, and thus by freeing man from the bondage of sin is applied holiness. Holiness makes divine love

[5] Walter Lippman, "A Preface to Morals," p. 22.

liberating, and gives to it its rescuing reality; for it is only as men grow in holiness that they increase in real, inner, spiritual freedom. Spiritual liberty consists in the goodness of holiness, and creates the actually happy life.

The holy love of divine personality with its essential freedom gives content to God's goodness. An abstract goodness, as an ideal apart from God's personality, is without effect. When Plato makes the good ultimate in his hierarchy of ideas, he does not succeed in giving it real power, no matter how much he exalts the superiority of intellect. He presents an ideal which can well be assailed in the questionings of those who ask for vital content and actual resultant. They are right when they call it an empty conception even after Plato adds beauty to the good. And yet Plato's idealism is far better than the position of those moderns who attempt to make the beautiful alone a substitute for the good and the right. All such abstractions are bloodless. They were so when scholastics of the Middle Ages subjected God's will to goodness. The opponents among scholastic thinkers, who made the good to be good because God willed it, were nearer the truth as long as they avoided making the divine will arbitrary. Goodness and God's will cover each other.

Jesus ascribes to God alone essential goodness, when He says to the rich young ruler, who calls Him good as a human rabbi: "Why callest thou

me good? There is none good but one, that is, God" (Matt. 19:17). When we find the actual content of God's goodness in love we possess a principle which is applicable to life. Its reality in God is not exclusive of human conditions. The acme of a sound morality for man can be found in the goodness of love, not as a commandment, but as personal life. The demonstration of the good life of love is given by Jesus Christ who reveals to us the personality of the Father (John 14:9). Such an actualized ideal in the Son of Man and the possible proof that goodness of love can solve our ethical problems and lead to the highest moral development, answer the objections of those pragmatists and realists who claim that the idea of goodness coming from the supernatural is empty. They reject the divine as useless in the life of action. As the scientist finds his hypothesis after observation and experiment, so the modern actualists, applying the scientific process, desire to arrive at a probable hypothesis of the good through mere human experiment and experience. This produces a very shifting and uncertain basis for the good life, and, by rejecting the ideal, depreciates the real value of the good. Professor Dewey is the outstanding spokesman of this pragmatic attitude. In his latest book, "The Quest for Certainty," he states: "Judgments about values are judgments about the conditions and the results of experienced objects; judgments about that which should reg-

ulate the formation of our desires, affections and enjoyments.'"[6] This is the final answer of the pragmatist as he endeavors to solve the construction of the good. The good cannot in its real, inspiring ideality be constructed. It must be seen and followed after the example of Jesus Christ.

After this analysis of God we must return to the summing up of all that He is as a free personality of love and an eternal spirit. We must find Him in His concrete reality and existence as we commune with Him, as Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier. If we begin to worship Him in spirit and truth we shall know Him, not after the pattern of our experience alone, but in accord with the truth of the New Testament. This truth of the free, eternal personality, God, will make us free. Then we shall not be uncertain of His existence and have an indefinite God like the modernists with whose God men cannot commune.[7]

If we compare the Christian conception of God with that of non-Christian religions we shall find that they have no idea of a free God. In all the pagan religions the gods are restricted to the sea or land, to the mountains or dales, to the fields or woods. They are bound within the limits of certain parts of nature. The household and hearth, the open market and forum also have their

[6] P. 265.

[7] Walter Lippman, "A Preface to Morals," chap. II, "God in the Modern World," p. 21 ff.

separate gods. At times they stand for the finite personification of peace or concord, of war or strife, of honest business or of thievery. When the pagan gods are most highly humanized, as in the Greek religion, they possess not only the virtues of imperfect men, but also their vices. Above the gods is absolute fate. Wherever human imagination creates the gods, or modifies the pure revealed conception of God, there come into being a multitude of gods with an appeal to the popular ideas. "The popular gods are not indefinite and unknowable. They have a definite history and their favorite haunts, and they have often been seen. They walk on earth; they might appear to anyone; they are angered; they are pleased; they weep and they rejoice; they eat and they may fall in love."[8] But such goods projected by the myth-making imagination of man are never free, but always finite, limited and bound.

When we compare the Christian God with the great Oriental religions the same result appears as becomes evident in the comparison with the pagan gods. Brahma or Atman in Hinduism is impersonal and absorbs human individuals. Man can only be free by ceasing to exist as a personality. The absolute is mere being or existence with no heart of love. It is but an *It* and it is never a *free He*. In Zoroastrianism we do have the good god Ormuzd, but he is greatly impeded by the

[8] Walter Lippman, "A Preface to Morals," p. 23.

evil god, Ahriman, who is a mighty, deified devil. While Mohammedanism has one god, he is arbitrary and absolute. Kismet, fate, even hems in the great Allah.

CHAPTER II

The Free Creator

It is impossible to escape the discussion of the relation of God to the world, of the eternal Spirit to nature. In consistent Christian thought we can never begin with creation, the work of God, but we must take our departure from God, the Creator. The absolute, eternal, infinite, personality of love must be our starting-point. While we may argue from the evidence of nature upward to God, after we have drawn the resultant of nature from the everlasting Spirit downward, it is most in agreement with the free God to show how He made the world. Out of His infinite power He projected the universe. There was a beginning to the world of nature and man. It is not only man that began to be, but also the world in which he lives. To assume that God created from all eternity, and that He had to act and make the universe, is to limit His liberty. Eternal action in God makes Him the slave of His own activity instead of putting His activity into His own control. Our activist age cannot understand the speculation of Aristotle who makes the first mover unmoved. Through science we are so largely returning to the philosophy of mere movement held by Heracleitus, that we are attempting

to conceive of a restless God, who must always be doing.

The question arises, How did the Spirit of God, pure and immaterial, produce matter out of spirit? Is matter not entirely different? The ancients, represented by Aristotle, sought to meet this difficulty by assuming eternal matter alongside of eternal spirit. But such an idea limits God through matter. Chaos then has its own conditions, and it is evolved into cosmos of itself. God would become only a secondary demiurge. He would be no originative creator, but only an architect or builder of matter into order at the very best. But such a limitation of the creator is not agreeable to the Christian idea of the free God. The usual way of stating God's creative priority to matter, has been to say, that God made the universe "out of nothing." The form of this explanation is quite misleading, and opens it at once to the objection that something could never be produced out of nothing. The intent and purpose of this statement is, however, quite clear. It denies that God had matter, or any material mass, out of which He made the world. Nothing is equivalent to non-matter, and "out of nothing" attempts to assert that the Spirit alone creates. But it is much clearer simply to say, that God out of the power of His will as spirit brought the universe into being.

But with the assertion of the creative power of the eternal personality, God, the Spirit that wills,

we must still ask, Why did spirit create so diverse a thing as matter? The answer to this question was very difficult and hard when matter was conceived in the purely popular way as the tangible, visible, ponderable, which our senses were supposed to find. The former scientific explanation, ever since the days of Democritus, also conceived of matter as particles that moved mechanically. Even the translation of the purely mechanical atom into the chemical atom did not change the essential materiality of the experienced universe. And to this day there are speculators in physiology, who conceive of it and the processes it shows, mechanically. They do not accept the conjecture of J. B. S. Haldane, that the fact of co-ordination in the processes of living bodies does not agree with the hypothesis that respiration, digestion, etc., are altogether mechanical. The psychology of behaviorism, so prevalent in America, reduces all the operations of mind to an action and behavior which is essentially material. The bodily movements, even when explained, biologically, are rather mechanical than really living operations. The mind, as we generally conceive of it, is entirely submerged.

But the latest investigations of physics, which have confirmed speculations slowly accumulating for a long time, entirely discountenance the old idea of matter as something extensible, tangible and ponderable. The atom is thought of as a minute world of positive and negative electrical

strains, moving wildly about in a sort of chaotic manner, and finally coming into order and cosmos.[1] As electricity is not and apparently cannot be defined as matter, what remains of the old idea of matter in the light of the electrical atom? In speaking of the fact that the old inert matter of the nineteenth century has entirely gone, Will Durant states the case very aptly and popularly, when he says: "Here, for example, was electricity, utterly inexplicable in terms of inertia and atoms; what was this mystical force which, added to mass, increased its energy, but added nothing to its dimension and its weight? How did an electric charge travel along a wire, or through wireless air? Was it something that moved through the atoms of the wire,—and then there were atoms smaller than the atoms? And in those electric waves, almost as fleet as light itself, what was it that moved?—atoms or 'ether' or nothing? Or when in the X-ray, an electric spark passed through a vacuum, emitting rays that penetrated the walls of the tube and changed a chemically sensitive plate,—what was it that passed through the vacuum or the walls? And when, as in radium, matter seemed inexhaustibly active, and atoms (the 'uncuttable') seemed indefinitely divisible, and every atom became a planetary system of electrical charges moving about nothing more substantial than another electrical charge,

[1] Jeans, "The Universe Around Us," p. 86 ff.

—to what pass had matter come to have lost its mass and weight and length and breadth and depth and impenetrability, and almost those sturdy properties that had once won it reverence of every tough and matter-of-fact mind! Was inertia, then, a myth? Could it be that matter was alive?'"[1]

And when the endeavor is made to materialize energy in the light of the electrical atom, it fails. There has been a constant advance in the effort to reduce matter to mere energy, and to do away with every medium through which energy can act. "Ostwald describes matter as merely a form of energy; Rutherford reduces the atom to units of positive and negative electricity; Lodge believes that the electron does not contain a material nucleus in addition to its charge; and Le Bon says simply: 'Matter is a variety of energy.' 'Some of the ablest men in the world at present,' says J. B. S. Haldane, 'regard matter as merely a special type of undulatory disturbance.' 'Matter,' says Eddington, 'is composed of protons and electrons, i. e., positive and negative charges of electricity; a plank is really empty space containing sparsely scattered electric charges.' 'The notion of mass,' says Whitehead, 'is losing its unique preeminence as being the one final permanent quantity.' 'Mass now becomes the name for a quantity of energy considered in relation

[1] "The Mansions of Philosophy," p. 61.

to some of its dynamic effects.' "[3] And thus matter, as formerly conceived, has been sublimated, refined, and etheralized, so that it becomes purely moving energy. There is nothing left of the old type of matter according to the latest scientific hypotheses.

With such a type of matter, approaching through energy almost to the threshold of the spirit, the problem of how spirit can project matter assumes a totally different aspect. It appears not improbable that energy can be created through the will of spirit. The will of a spirit and personality does not seem incapable of sending forth energy. This probability is strengthened by the experience of the human mind. While bodily movements, nerves and glands act upon consciousness through the brain, it is equally a matter of experience that the mind acts upon the body. When deliberations take place and alternatives are weighed they finally express themselves through motives that actuate the nervous outgo from the brain, and bring the muscles to action. These are the experienced facts prior to any hypothesis of the relation of mind and body. In their light does it not appear entirely probable that spirit can act upon matter? And if this is true, is there any valid objection in thought to accepting the creation of matter by spirit?

But the objection is raised, that mind is an

---

[3] Will Durant, "The Mansions of Philosophy," p. 62.

abstract noun expressing processes of life. Consequently we cannot argue from man to the possibility of the divine Spirit creating matter. We are told that we have too many facts that show the inter-relation of mind and body to be the outcome of the unity of life, and not the operation of two distinct and different functionings upon each other. But, in the end, the attempted synthesis of matter and mind in man only leads to the renewed emphasis of matter, in a manner that contradicts the latest discoveries and hypotheses of physics. Will Durant, after endeavoring a synthesis through life, reverts to matter. He represents the whole modern group, which is attempting to arrive at a unity of matter and mind. These speculators all gravitate back to a more or less crude materialism even if they call it life. Durant says: "There is 'interaction of mind and body,' not in the sense that two distinct entities influence one another, but only in the sense that one organ and function of the body (nerves — thought) influences, and is influenced by, other organs and functions of the body (lungs — respiration, stomach — digestion, limbs — locomotion, gonads — reproduction, glands — secretion); a more highly evolved portion of living substance, through 'the integrative action of the nervous system,' unifies and directs the remainder of the organism. The highest form of 'mind' is kin in nature, and continuous in development with the lowest form of life and the primitive

vitality of the atom.'"[4] This attitude is the outcome of the hypothesis of evolution, and to conserve this speculation, the peculiarities of the mind are overlooked, and it is approximated to the electrical atom. To speak of the vitality of the atom is pure nonsense unless electricity is life, which remains to be proved. The phenomena of consciousness do not move in space like the functionings of bodily organs. They can never be made visible and tangible. The hypothesis of the unification of matter and spirit is maintained to the neglect of the actual functionings of the mind particularly in its higher aspects. A careful consideration of all facts does not set aside the assertion, that the power of the spirit, especially in its divine aspect, can and does create matter.

If the spirit creates matter we must find in it the cause of the universe. When God is accepted as the creator of the universe, He is often spoken of as the "first cause." But this term is unfortunate and liable to be misconstrued. It may be taken to mean the first member in the series of causes and effects. An eternal, supermundane God cannot, however, be made a part of all secondary causes, which really happens when He is imagined as the mere beginner of the line of causes and effects. It is better to conceive of God, the spirit, as the ground of the universe. This

[4] "The Mansions of Philosophy," p. 80.

idea, too, must be guarded so that God is not made the mere underpinning of the world, and a part of it. Otherwise He takes the place of the mythical turtle of the ancients which was supposed to support the world. God must be conceived in the manner of spirit to have brought into being the whole chain of connected causes and effects, which run through nature without actually being included in it.

The creating spirit, God, is not fully understood, as far as He can be, by deriving the world merely from the power of His will. The unity of the divine personality must include the intelligence, and the consequent wisdom of His actions. Divine creative Love is thoughtful and purposeful. This is involved in the belief in God as the free creator. It cannot be omitted, or the world would be the result of blind will which would be identical with unintelligent force. Among modern advocates of evolution there are many, who following Darwin, reject the old conception of design presented to a past generation by Paley. In reacting against this idea of fixed design they have drifted toward accidentalism, and they have not seen the indication of the facts of nature which point to purpose. The world in its upward course is supposed to be the result of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. Chaos is made the progenitor of cosmos. Out of disorder, order is held to have come without the intervention of a directing creative spirit. Where some mind is still

allowed, it is included in nature through the unsupported hypothesis of panpsychism. Mind is then imagined as having worked up through the constantly more highly differentiated forms of existence and life by the method of trial and error. It is compared to the results found in the throwing of dice that are not loaded. But the examination of the outcome of probability, which is mathematically calculable, contradicts the possibility of accidentalism producing such effects as we find in the whole universe.

If we examine the development of the starry heavens and start from the modern assumption of planetesimal condensation, we shall not have a jumble of stars, planets, and comets, but rather a marvelous order of movement, and an interrelation which can only be expressed in terms of mathematics. The physical aspect of the worlds about us is not chaotic, but in wonderful harmony in the relation of the elements. The great stars are created in many varieties. Some tend to break up. "Aggregations rather greater than our Sun have a strong tendency to subdivide, but when the mass is reduced a little the danger quickly passes and the impulse to subdivision is satisfied. Here it would seem the work of creation might cease."[8] And yet the division may still go on, but its end leads to a wonderful harmony. In the stars above and the world below

[8] Eddington, "Science and the Unseen World," p. 14.

the electrical charges of the primitive chaos have merged into ninety-two elements. These elements have a definite chemical value, and combine in calculable relations. There is a wonderful order among them all. "At root the diversity of the ninety-two elements reflects the diversity of the integers from one to ninety-two; because the chemical characteristics of element No. 11 (sodium) arise from the fact that it has the power at low temperatures of gathering round it eleven negative electric particles; those of No. 12 (magnesium) from its power of gathering twelve particles; and so on."[6] Still more remarkable is the fact that carbon and its compounds answer to the number six. "We can scarcely call it an accident that among the integers there should happen to be the number 6; but I do not know how otherwise to express the fact that organic life would not have begun if Nature's arithmetic had overlooked the number 6."[7]

When we pass from chemistry to biology it is to be noted that even the simplest forms of low type show actions that can scarcely be explained mechanically. The little monocellular Didinium approaches its food by sending out very minute arrow-like structures. Were we to observe under the microscope the low form, the Paramecium in a glass globe with a separating glass wall having

---

[6] Eddington, "Science and the Unseen World," p. 18.
[7] Eddington, "Science and the Unseen World," p. 19.

an opening, what would we see as it has food put before it? "It moves directly towards the food; it strikes the glass partition; it retreats in a straight line; apparently it is a machine. But suddenly it veers slightly about; then it sets out again, at an angle, and once more strikes the glass. It rebounds, and veers, and strikes again. . . . It rebounds, and veers, and passes through the opening to the food. There is nothing in the make-up of any machine, nothing in the principles of mechanics, that will explain this judicious veering about, this appearance of directive *purpose* in the lowest animals known to man."[8] If such facts indicate purpose in the lowest forms of life, how much more evidence appears as we rise from the simpler to the more complex living bodies, and up to man. Biology can never consistently frame a philosophy of life which disregards and omits the idea of purpose that runs all through organic structures.[9]

These proofs of purpose, however, have not always been conceived of as pointing to an intelligence above nature. There is a tendency among some scientific men, who claim to be religious, to reduce the creator to the creation. Professor J. B. S. Haldane denies the supernatural, and includes God altogether within the world.[10] A very

---

[8] Will Durant, "The Mansions of Philosophy," p. 89.

[9] Pringle-Pattison holds that biology has confirmed the idea of purpose.

[10] "The Sciences and Philosophy," p. 293 ff.

similar attitude is taken by Professor A. N. Whitehead of Harvard University in one of his latest publications, "Process and Reality." In proposing an organic philosophy of life he places God Himself into the process. Among other statements he avers, that God in His primordial nature is simply the concrescence of a unity of conceptual feelings. But God has a consequent nature which "is the physical prehension by God of the actualities of the evolving universe. . . This is the conception of God, according to which He is considered as the outcome of creativity, as the foundation of order, and as the goal toward novelty."[11] The creativity makes God, and God does not make the creativity. God produces novelty through the eternal objects, but He is no personal spirit as He has "a hybrid physical feeling."[12] God and the actual world are joined together. There comes about an "objectification of God in a temporal subject effected by the hybrid feelings with God's conceptual feelings as data."[13] A clearer statement free from the abstruse technical language of Whitehead is the following: " 'God' is that actuality in the world, in virtue of which there is physical 'law.' "[14] He is included in the concrescence of the world. The actual process on one side is God. In consequence: "It is as true to say, that God is permanent and the World fluent, as that the World

[11] P. 134, 135.
[12] P. 343.
[13] P. 377.
[14] P. 434.

is permanent and God is fluent. It is as true to say that God is one and the World is many, as that the World is one and God many. It is as true to say that, in comparison with the World, God is actual eminently, as that, in comparison with God, the World is actual eminently. It is as true to say that the World is immanent in God, as that God is immanent in the World. It is as true to say that God transcends the World, as that the World transcends God. It is as true to say that God creates the World, as that the World creates God. God and the World are the contrasted opposites in terms of which Creativity achieves its supreme task of transforming disjoined multiplicity, with its diversities in opposition, into concrescent unity, with its diversities in contrast.''[15]

With a different terminology and variant words this presentation of Whitehead is representative of the evolutional pantheism of today. In complete opposition, the idea of the free creator is a better answer to all facts of nature and mankind, and presents a juster and nobler ideal.

As a similar denial of the idea of the free creator we may note a most curious and unbalanced effort to define God, not the personal God of Christianity, made by J. Middleton Murry in his book called ''God.'' He is groping after a God who is organic process in an evolutional sense, but who is also a value beyond and after

[15] P. 528.

the merely physical and biological. Three ideas of God are posited: the God of experience, the God of values, and the God who is incarnate. In the God of values and the God incarnate we are to arrive at the metabiological, the after-biological. Man is supposed to have created his God. Christ, simply and purely a natural man, made a God who deserted Him in the last hour of His failure. But "the Christian God is the greatest achievement of that branch of humanity to which I[16] belong; it is more wonderful even than the creation of the God of Jesus."[17] At present men live in this conception, and they do not seem to be able to escape it. Actually, however, God and the soul are one in the same process of the organic and super-organic universe. "God is one means of description; organism is another."[18] But today organism is a simpler calculus than God, and all that God is may be termed life. He does not exist as a unique, infinite, creating personality. This Christian God once found must be denied. Almost one hears a repetition of Nietzsche's fierce cry: "God is dead." It is hard to unify clearly all that Mr. Murry makes out of God. He has a peculiar self-made idol. God is not finally a reality, an actual existence, but only an interpretation through the experiences of man as part of the whole evolving

[16] This refers to Mr. Murry.
[17] "God," p. 231.
[18] "God," p. 301.

universe. What a strange sort of non-free God is presented in this erratic, confused speculation! Such is the latest wisdom of the folly of one who would be superwise.

In contrast with the strange idols of imagination, which some modern thinkers dare to label God, it is important to note that only the faith in one personal God sustains His liberty. "There is only one God, and one vast system dependent upon Him as its informing nature. God who sustains all the relationships which constitute the existence of the universe,—God who by His nature makes the universe a sphere not of coincidences but of uniformities—God whose existence at its center gives to the universe the quality and character of being an organic whole and not a mere totality,—God who is revealed in varying degrees throughout the universe,—is revealed most fully as the center of moral and personal response. It is one God who is all this."[19]

---

[19] Valentine, "What Do We Mean by God," p. 184.

CHAPTER III

The Free Sustainer

It has been the fate of the statement in Genesis, that God rested on the seventh day, to be interpreted in the sense of God's withdrawal from the world He had created. The universe went upon its own course, and God was an absentee. This idea overlooked the fact, that the resting of God was relative to the originating power of creation, and was given as a motive in the Jewish faith for hallowing the Sabbath day. Jesus never understood His Father to be at rest in His beneficient work. In order to defend His healing of the impotent man on the Sabbath day, He said: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (John 5:17). The apology of Christ for His own act of love on the Sabbath day of rest was the continuity of the Father's constant blessed work. God was not above the world as an idle God. It is an error to picture Him as the Ancient of Days sitting upon His throne in Aristotelian self-contemplation.

When the Deists arose they conceived of the world as a clock that had been wound up by God at the creation, which was now running until it would run down. They were not bold enough to speak of rewinding the clock, and the Nitzschean recurrence of cycles did not occur to them. What

was the reason for this idea of a self-running world, and of an altogether transcendent God? Walter Lippman has misunderstood the motive for this picture. He ascribes it to a proposal of a truce in the conflict of religion and science. His statement is: "There is, for example, the suggestion first put out, I believe, in the Seventeenth Century that God made the universe like a clock, and that having started it running he will let it alone till it runs down. By this ingenuous metaphor, which can be neither proved nor disproved, it was possible to reconcile for a time the scientific notion of natural law with the older notion of God as creator and judge."[1] This idea of a reconciliation is Lippman's own conception. The Deists held to three beliefs, God, freedom and immortality, as essential religion. To conserve freedom as the gift of God He was made purely transcendent, and was kept away from the world. There was no direct scientific motive present in that age.

In complete opposition to the transcendent God stands the idea of the immanent God. While transcendence favors a free God, if it is justly maintained, immanence submerges God into the world. The Oriental pantheism made the world illusory, a mere Maya, and absorbed it in Brahma. The western pantheism of philosophers, poets, and theologians sinks God into the universe.

---

[1] "A Preface to Morals," p. 121.

In the history of modern philosophy it was Malebranche who first in his speculations chained God in the universe. Spinoza also, despite his idea of the mystical absolute, brought God down into the world through the attributes of thought and extension. Hegel in his scheme of logical development had God come to Himself first in the consciousness of man. God was enclosed in the movement from thesis to antithesis to synthesis, until He finally emerged as ultimate spirit. Whether we study Royce or Bradley, or Bosanquet, everywhere in different terminology we find a God imprisoned in the universe.

Apparently the so-called "New Theology" of a few decades ago rescued the free personality of God although it stressed His immanence over against the thought of an absent God. But its advocates did not succeed, and finally God became too closely tied to the world and to mankind. The inner light of the Friends was made a part of God by some theological thinkers. To our day this thought is popularized and men speak of finding God within themselves. I recall a conversation with a cleric who said: "My God dwells within me." When he was asked whether this God was also above him, he denied such an idea. "To whom then do you pray?" was the question next put to the cleric. "To the God in me," was the reply. He never succeeded in disentangling God within himself from his own ego, and consequently he prayed to his own self imaginatively

sublimated into God. God, or some of God, was shut up in the consciousness of this finite, erring man. While not all immanental theologians made as crude assertions as this cleric, they did not succeed, in their spiritualization of the immanent God, from enclosing Him, if not in nature, at least in the world of humanity taken either individually or collectively. The new humanism which claims to be the coming religion is ostensibly atheistic, but some of its adherents, after all, sublimate the idea of humanity into a kind of mystical unity that approaches a pantheistic conception of God.

Among poets the imagination did not usually blossom into the poetic materialism of Lucretius. If we select but a few we shall not find in their ideas the God of Browning or Christina Rosetti. There is no optimistic hope of the God of Love in the heavens that makes all right in the world. Goethe, e. g., adopted the philosophy of Spinoza, and conceives of God within the universe weaving its web. Shelly, called an atheist, is pantheistically inclined.

There are two poets who struggle with the God within and above the world, Wordsworth and Tennyson. Wordsworth, the author of the ecclesiastical sonnets, and apparently an appreciative churchman, does speak of

> "Nature's self, which is the breath of God,
> Or His pure Word by miracle revealed."[3]

[3] "The Prelude," Book V, 1, 221.

This sounds very orthodox. But mostly Wordsworth exalts Nature, which is always capital for him. It is the moving, inspiring, mystical power and appears to take the place of God. It has a "holy plan."[3] In it

> "With an eye made quiet by the power
> Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
> We see into the life of things."[4]

Of the universe Wordsworth sings:

"Wisdom and Spirit of the universe!
Thou Soul, that art the Eternity of thought."[5]

And again in the same strain:

> "Wisdom and Spirit of the universe!
> Thou soul art the eternity of thought
> That givest to forms and images a breath
> And everlasting motion."[6]

Nature is sovereign and to be prized for her own sake. She has her own soul.

"O Soul of Nature! excellent and fair!
Thou didst rejoice with men with whom I, too,
Rejoiced in early youth, before the winds
And roaring waters, and in lights and shades,
That marched and countermarched about the
hills

[3] Lines written in early spring, 1798.
[4] Lines at Tintem Abbey, 40 ff.
[5] "Influence of Natural Objects," I, 1.
[6] "The Prelude," Book I, 1, 40.

In glorious apparition, powers on whom
I daily waited, now all eye and now
All ear.'"[7]

In nature man finds truth, rest and divinity. Wordsworth says:

"Wanderer as I am,
If, having walked with Nature threescore years,
And offered, far as frailty would allow,
My heart a daily sacrifice to Truth,
I now affirm of Nature and of Truth,
Whom I have served, that their *Divinity*
Revolts, offended at the ways of men
Swayed by such motives.'"[8]

There is a vital spirit in Nature.

" 'To every form of being is assigned,'
Thus calmly spake the venerable Sage,
'An *active* Principle: howe'er removed
From sense and observation, it subsists
In all things, in all natures.' '"[9]

It is divine monition that Nature yields. In the well-known and often quoted poem, "The World Is Too Much With Us; Late and Soon," Wordsworth desires to be a pagan, and see

---

[7] "The Prelude," Book XII, 1, 94.
[8] "The Excursion," Book IV, 1, 978ff.
[9] "The Excursion," Book IX, 1, 1 ff.

"Proteus rising from the sea, or hear old Triton blow his wreathed horn." This sentiment accords well with Wordsworth's nature-worship, which displaces God. It is in essence an adoration of immanent spirit within the universe, and its whole tenor is pantheistic. God within nature, or nature as God, is the poetic religion of Wordsworth.

When we turn from Wordsworth to Tennyson there is a clearer message of the God above. It is true that Tennyson, living in the days of the rise of Darwinism, had his struggles. He was forced to adjust himself to the new age. In his poem on the death of Arthur Hallam, "In Memoriam," there arises the doubt, which says: "Man dies, nor is there hope in dust."[10] Are sleep and death but one? Shall grave doubts that come from a merely natural world rule? Or shall "we trust that somehow good will be the final goal of ill"?[11]

After all Tennyson looks up to the free, though mysterious, God above and comforts himself thus:

> "We have but faith: we cannot know,
> For knowledge is of things we see;
> And yet we trust it comes from thee,
> A beam in darkness: let it grow."[12]

But when the poet looks upon the flower in the crannied wall, he sings:

[10] Canto XXXV.
[11] Canto LIV.
[12] Introduction, verse 6.

"Little flower—but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is."[18]

Is there not here some longing that rests upon the conception of a connected universe? Is God within this world? With this problem Tennyson struggles in "The Higher Pantheism." The sun, moon, and stars, are they the vision of Him who reigns? Or "Is not the Vision He, tho' He be not that which He seems?"

Man asks whether all that exists is sign and symbol of division from God. Is "He not all but thou"? God would appear to be the totality of the universe, man alone excepted; and yet to God man speaks though "Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet." God is Law say some, Law is God say others.

"And the ear of man cannot hear, and the eye
of man cannot see;
But if we could see and hear, this Vision—were
it not He."

In these thoughts Tennyson presents the doubt and uncertainty of his reflective mind upon the alternative between a transcendent and an immanent God. With this dilemma thoughtful men have ever wrestled. Can we find some clue that

[18] Holy Grail.

avoids the "either" and "or" in this problem?

If God is free, and the eternal Spirit prior to the universe, we cannot stress His immanence to the neglect of His transcendence. A merely immanent God is lost in the universe. At the same time a God altogether apart from the world does not answer to certain evidence. The same effects that mark His creative origination of the world still subsist. The created universe is not static but dynamic. The processes which first lifted the world out of chaos into a cosmos are still continuing. The restless electrons and ions which circle about in the atom can be observed to come to the pass of orderly relation. The stars and constellations above are forming and breaking up.[14] The great heated light-bearers of the heavens are in a constant flux. Only the moon seems a burnt out cinder of a world. Our earth is not finished, for geologic changes are still going on. Volcanoes are seething, and earthquakes are proof of the settling of the earth along the line of faults. Glaciers are still grinding down rocks and turning them into soil. Niagara Falls continues to cut its way backward, and other rocks are suffering detrition through ice and other agencies. Chemical elements are breaking up into radium. Plants are going through minute variations or show sudden transformations and mutations. Animals are not altogether static

[14] Jeans, "The Universe Around Us," p. 16 ff.

even though they gravitate into specific species. All the forces that started the world through the power of the divine will are at work now. While God is not enclosed in the universe, the operations of His will and purpose testify to the continued presence of His power.

The immanence of God within the world must never be strained beyond the effects of His constantly creative will. In nature we find many actions, which according to moral standards are cruel. The assassin bug inserts its poisonous proboscis into its victim. The bees kill their drones. The spiders eat their young. The butcher-bird hangs up his slain victim. Huxley was correct when he asserted that there are no morals in the sub-human world, and among animals. In consequence we cannot make all these actions a direct part of an immanent God without making God either unmoral or impersonal. We cannot make Him unmoral, and still conceive of Him as a personality. If we think of Him in impersonal terms, and make Him the abstract whole of the universe, He ceases to be a free spirit. Nature, therefore, being what it is, we must not involve God in it, to the degree of taking away His personality and His freedom of creative will. His will dare not be immersed into the flow of the evolving world.

But there is a confirmatory argument to prove that a free spirit can constantly act upon and through the laws of nature without being im-

prisoned within them in the relation of man to nature. Ignorant but free man has set floods afoot through the denudation of forests. He has thus changed the face of the earth, and modified its climate. Oases have been turned into deserts. On the other hand wise understanding of nature has led man to cause the desert to bloom like a rose. Irrigation canals have made barren plains to bear grain and fruit. Great dams have diverted the course of mighty streams. Man has done more to change rivers than the tree-gnawing and dam-building beavers. A wizard like Edison has helped not only to modify all civilization, but to affect nature itself. Burbank has produced new berries and fruits through wonderful cross-fertilization. New breeds of pigeons, new species of dogs and horses have been brought about through the artificial selection of the human breeder. Thus the evidence of man entering into nature and changing it, limited as he is, demonstrates the control of mind over nature. How much more is it possible to assume that the infinite Spirit, God, operates within the processes of nature, and the order of its operations, which He has made, without being mystically, or as mere energy, or evolution, within them.

The problem of the free Sustainer of the universe also involves the relation of God to mankind, which dwells upon earth. Does God act upon man, or does He permit man to go his ways altogether without any influence upon his history

and development? Has God given man liberty, and then withdrawn from the stage of this world, and allowed man to play his own tragedy and comedy? God would not be a free God if He were subjected to all the fancies and whims of man. Any conception of the Eternal that bans Him into history is untrue to God, and to the facts of history. Divine government is not interference with the mere causes and effects of human efforts, but a direction which leaves both God and man free. Providence must not be construed as fatalism, and the acts of man reduced to a puppet show whose strings are pulled by God. Such an idea is unworthy of God and man.

On the surface human development is largely helped or hindered by the desire for food, clothing and shelter. Man pays much attention to his bodily welfare. For it he labors; to protect it and ward off evils, he struggles and fights. We cannot be just to the life of the individual, nor to the history of nations, if we disregard this economic urge. Prosperity in a nation is not interpreted as the existence of great purposes and noble idealisms, but as excellent trade, sound commerce, increasing sales, growing foreign business, and rapid increase of national and individual wealth. The interference with the economic needs and desires of men leads to war. Nations that are limited in resources of land, or coal, or iron, or oil, strive to obtain them in colonies, or through trade preferences in other lands. Railroads are

built, and navies are increased, for the sake of trade, or to protect commerce. England needs colonies to give it food in exchange for its manufactures. France must have more iron ores and coal. Germany wants colonies and trade for its growing population. When these wishes are not granted, or thwarted by other nations, war results. Great inventions bring better economic living. These economic motives for bread, and bread alone, are man's own choice and desire. They are not to be found in the unequally given resources from God. He is not the fate behind man's economic over-emphasis.

But there are other factors in human history which do indicate that the free Sustainer of the universe remains the free ruler and governor of mankind finally, even though men are permitted to go their own way. God can and does enter into history and change its course. Events that appear to be altogether the result of human planning, and the outcome of man's action, often show at critical moments the guidance of a free God, who, without destroying human liberty, still directs the course of history. History becomes the interaction of a free God and a non-compelled humanity. It may seem, for example, that the defeat of Napoleon, and the utter break-up of his army in the Russian campaign, was the result of the shrewdness of the Russians. But how could so able a general as Napoleon allow his army to be led so far away from their base of supplies?

Why did so wise a tactician not know the danger of the Russian winter? What caused the little giant's strategy to fail so miserably? Who turned aside the wisdom of the wise? It is not unreasonable, in addition to Russian strategy, and the failure of Napoleon and his generals, to assume some divine intervention through storm, and the human instrumentality of the Russians. Only those who reject God to begin with can refuse to allow this probable inference.

If we employ another example, taken from the last, great World War, we shall be led to a similar hypothesis. Why were the Germans so blind as not to realize that they could not with impunity torpedo our ships continuously? Might not the patience of a peace-loving president finally come to an end when every promise was broken? How could such able warriors possess so poor a judgment of the human mind, and have so little genuine, practical psychology as to fail to note the real attitude of other nations? The strongest and best armed forces were at last defeated, not merely through human planning, but also through some mysterious divine direction, which used human agencies to attain some wise purpose.

This assumption is strengthened by the experience of the individual, which runs parallel to the lessons of history. It happens again and again in our life, that some small event, not planned or calculated by us, changes the whole course of our destiny. There occur those accidental experi-

ences, unforeseen and not prepared for, which exert the largest influence upon our views and actions. We may call them luck or ill fortune, but these names are only tags of ignorance. They declare that we lack an explanation, and cannot assign a reasonable place to the unexpected events that so frequently form a turning-point in our life. What objection can legitimately be urged against assuming that divine intervention has caused what we call accidents? The longer we live a life in communion with God the more we become assured that this hypothesis is correct. It is a matter of practical experience that grows out of a life of faith.

The free action and governance of God among men may also be inferred from great ruling ideas, and from the necessity of the moral order in the world. Ranke, the German historian, was convinced that the best philosophy of history implied the movement of great ideas and noble ideals through mankind. These were to him divine conceptions that rose above the strife and turmoil of the nations. But ideas that change mankind are generally centered in some leading personality. A great man understands his age, and focuses within himself its problems and their solution. He feels that somehow there is a divinity that shapes the ends of history. The most outstanding type of this conviction in our American history is Abraham Lincoln. At the most critical moments he felt that there was some

divine direction back of his plans and actions. It gave him certainty in the moments of uncertainty.

The strongest evidence for the free guidance of the world by God is found in the personality of Jesus Christ. He, standing in the center of time, turned the course of history into new channels. Although He has never been fully understood and followed, still He has brought new ideas and ideals into mankind. With His pierced hand He has lifted the old world out of its rusty hinges. He has seen a new world not yet realized, but coming nearer as men catch the vision of the Kingdom of God on earth. However we may interpret Christ, we cannot escape the conclusion, that, in and through Him, God is endeavoring to make a new humanity, and to lead us to a new freedom.

PART II

MAN'S LOSS OF LIBERTY

CHAPTER IV

Man's State Before the Loss

One of the questions that will always be before men is, whether they are only being led into liberty gradually through the power of Christianity, or whether the Christian faith claims to be merely a restoration of original freedom. In the discussion of this problem we must attempt to speculate on the beginnings of man upon earth. To return to the infancy of the human race has ever been an interesting pursuit of history. Through the advances made in modern anthropology it has become even more attractive. Did the human race begin in many places or in one? Was its start the coming into existence of a whole tribe like the beginning of a species of animals? As to mankind arising in various localities there seems at present a tendency to assume, that it began somewhere in eastern Asia. Anthropology has no answer to the question, whether one man, or many, came into being in the geological age when remnants of man himself, or of his early, primitive tools are found. But Christianity accepting the Jewish tradition holds that there was one man, Adam. But what was his state? Here two opinions contend with each other in our present speculations. Was man originally free, or

has he only become liberated in the course of evolution? Which of these two attitudes about man's liberty is in best accord with Christian truth? Or is there a third possibility? These are the questions now before us.

Up to the middle of the last century there was only one conception of the first man. It was that which is found in Genesis embellished through imagination. But with the coming of Darwinism, and the growth of the acceptance of some sort of hypothesis of evolution, the universal rule of the idea, that Adam, the first man, was a historical fact passed away in many quarters. He was displaced by a creature whom the speculations of science created. The scriptural Adam was usually pictured as a noble Caucasian, of the best Aryan type. He was free and intelligent. His build was upright, and his countenance frank and manly. To him was given Eve, glorious in her pristine beauty, made not of the earth, but of Adam. Taken from his side she was destined to stand at his side. Not from his feet did God create her to be man's slave, nor from man's head did she spring, like the goddess from the head of Zeus, to be the lord of man. The man and his wife lived in a beauteous garden, full of trees of every sort, and planted with fruit trees. It was a place of beauty in which nature and culture had added every charm. There was no hard labor in the sweat of the brow, but day after day passed in glorious and happy enjoyment. This Eden was

a true paradise in which innocent and childlike beings dwelt. But their minds were not those of childhood, for they were such observers of the life about them, that they gave names to animals. Adam and Eve were the first practical nature students, and the original zoologists. Such was the imaginative picture of Adam and Eve dwelling in blissful, glorious liberty upon a beautiful earth.

No one has pictured the first man and woman in their Assyrian garden more beautifully than John Milton, whose poetic fancy became the common conception. He thus describes Adam and Eve in the fourth book of "Paradise Lost":

"Two of far nobler shade, erect and tall,
Godlike erect, with native honor clad,
In naked majesty, seemed lords of all,
And worthy seemed; for in their looks divine
The image of their glorious Maker shone;
Truth, wisdom, sanctitude severe and pure
(Severe, but in true filial freedom placed),
Whence true authority in men; though both
Not equal, as their sex not equal seemed;
For contemplation he and valour formed;
For softness she, and sweet attractive grace;
He for God only, she for God in him:
His fair large front, and eyes sublime, declared
Absolute rule; and hyacinthine locks
Round from his parted forelock manly hung
Clustering, but not beneath his shoulders broad;

She, as a veil, down to the slender waist
Her unadorned golden tresses wore
Dishevelled, but in wanton ringlets waved,
As the vine curls her tendrils, which implied
Subjection, but inquired with gentle sway,
And by her yielded, by him best received,
Yielded with coy submission, modest pride,
And sweet, reluctant, amorous delay."

This glorious picture of man and woman, before shame entered mankind, in many features was the common Christian belief. It is true that the poet's detail painting of Adam and Eve were not taken as real, but it was considered as not incompatible with the wonderful, free creatures as they came fresh from the breath and hand of God. The whole relation of the sexes, and the place of man and woman, which Milton drew, were the ruling ideas down to our times. Today this whole outlook upon the first man and woman, and all that it implies, is set aside without argument, and simply smiled at by the wise and the unwise.

The Adam and Eve of Milton were also the Adam and Eve of Wordsworth. He, too, lived in the pre-Darwinian age. In his poem, "The Prelude,"[1] he thus describes man:

"In the midst stood Man,
Outwardly, inwardly contemplated,
As, of all visible creatures, crown, though born

[1] Book VIII, 1, 485 ff.

Of dust, and kindred to the worm; a Being,
Both in perception and discernment, first
In every capability of rapture,
Through the divine effect of power and love;
As, more than anything we know, instinct
With godhead, and, by reason and by will,
Acknowledging dependency sublime."

In this realm of beauteous, poetic fancy and high imagination the first man and woman were presented to men. Mankind was proud of its noble, godlike beginning. Freedom, God's great gift, was the noblest crown of humanity which was called to rule the earth and multiply in sweet, unconscious intercourse. "Simplicity and spotless innocence" ruled heart and mind, and no evil imagination, nor unbridled passion, moved and controlled men as they exercised their sex functions, not like animals, but as godlike, pure and uncontaminated beings. One hates to leave this Paradise of our first parents, this golden age of sinless liberty. And yet is there not much romantic imagination in this picture? Has not the simple account of Genesis with its childlike story been too highly spiced? Strange to say, even sober dogmaticians could not rid themselves of the lure of Miltonic poetry. Must we maintain this conception to hold, that sin is not man's first condition? This question can be answered better after we have put into contrast, and bold, opposite relief, the modern scientific view, which has in-

vaded much present-day thinking, and has even conquered the prevalent modern theology.

When we examine the first traces of man in the geological strata we find here and there a few bones. Out of these comparative anatomy has constructed the first men. They are supposed to begin, as seen in the Java Trinil bones, as creatures closely related in their bent bodies, their low brows, and their small brain-pans to the apes. While not directly descended from them they are held to have had a common ancestor. From the Java Trinil man, the Pithecanthropos Erectus, we ascend through various types like the Piltdown man to the Neanderthal man.[3] He is a more man-like creature. It must be noted, that no complete skeletons have as yet been found, but that the construction is purely speculative. It seems to fit in, however, with the ruling assumptions of a connected series of animals in the evolutional scale. Man is thus the outcome of a purely natural process, and he is not of divine origin directly.

The primitive man is ignorant of all the forces of nature, and he must struggle to maintain himself. It is true that while many of the animals that lived contemporaneously with man have failed in the struggle for existence, man, when he really became human, continued with little variation of build and structure. But it was not

[3] For an argument against this theory of man's evolution, cf. N. S. Moore, "The Theory of Evolution," p. 127 ff.

due to intelligence that he survived. Gradually through the hit and miss method, and the trial and error approach to nature, he fought his way through. By the way of experiment he developed in action the power of reflection. On the road to larger liberty, as man learned to control the world about him, he lost his dreads and fears. He increasingly became less animal and more man. This is supposed to be the story of the liberation that man effected for himself out of the enslavement of the universe.

In an inhospitable world, without even a hut, the first men are conjectured to have lived in caves. Wild and cruel, strong and powerful, they fought not only against nature, but among themselves. The women were the prey of men, taken and carried away by force, and cowed into submission. Gradually the secret of fire was discovered, and mankind stopped eating raw fruits and meat. It passed from the stone age to the iron age. The simpler flints gave way to the iron tools. A precarious living was obtained first through the hunt, until later man settled down to agriculture, and found steadier nourishment. Only late did the manufacturing age begin. Thus man pushed upward, and rose by his own efforts from barbarism to civilization in slow stages.

At the beginning man impressed by the terrors of nature framed his gods from fear. Petronius said: "Fear made the gods." In some places he took a stone, or wood, and made a fetich out

of it in order to overcome its power. Again there were tribal gods pictured as totems. The first notion of spirits, it is claimed, arose because primitivate imagination personalized the human breath. The dream world also led man to see himself in a non-material manner of existence. When the spirit, or breath of man, passed away, it was supposed to live on, and thus man began to worship his ancestors. In this spiritualization, man turned the material breath, the idle dreams, and the passing visions, into gods. First he feared them and was overawed by them. But gradually man emancipated himself more and more from the gods he created. Then he made them in his image, and finally he projected monotheism. And today, through the religion of science, and the ideal of evolution, he is commencing to free himself from all old notions of God, and becoming the master of his fate, and the captain of his soul. Such is the long, long trail which man has traveled until he has come into the glorious liberty of the twentieth century.

What shall we say about this hypothesis of the rise of man from the enslavement of nature to his self-possession in liberty? It is thoroughly material, and fits in with the modern conjecture which reduces mind to body in the unity of a common organic functioning. But is it the solution of vital freedom? To answer this question we must take into consideration the fact that man has not always progressed. There are evidences, over-

looked by the pure evolutionists, to show that it is possible to hold that man descended from an original, high estate into the enslavement of sin. And this conjecture is in better accord with a free, personal God, and with the best clue to the understanding of human sin, and the true inner, spiritual liberty of man.

There is a confusion in the materialistic idea in reference to freedom as found externally, and the real liberty of the human spirit. But even in the advancement of civilization man has not attained what he sought. He has overcome some of the hindrances of nature, but in passing from the simpler forms of life to the complex conditions of modern existence he has forged for himself new chains. The machine age has not merely eased human living, it has also enslaved many beings. There is truth in the protests of Butler in Erewhon against the domination of the machine. Furthermore, the machine, and the increased knowledge of the processes of nature, have not brought unmixed blessing. The most advanced research in chemistry is partly employed in discovering more deadly gases to be used in some future war. Aeroplanes are being studied and experimented with not only for transport, but also with a view to some possible world-conflagration in time to come. Man has not become moral enough, and free enough, to use his knowledge for common liberty. His insight into the forces of nature has not emancipated him spir-

itually. Civilization has not been a real redeemer. In many ways it has made life harder and more burdensome. The simple happiness which accompanies true freedom is not found in the evolution of man's discoveries and inventions. Society as a whole is still sick, and under the bondage of many evils, physical and economic. Paradise has not come and is not in sight.

By many men civilization has not been used as an opportunity of vital culture. Culture has not kept step with civilization. The latter means to the mass of men, more wealth, more trade and commerce, greater national prosperity, larger ease, and greater access to more luxuries. Men have become subject to more desires. When some wants are gratified for a time, others arise. There comes a period of surfeit and a blase condition of disillusionment. Is this modern life of such a sort, liberty or degradation? Every whim and taste long to be satisfied, and men have become soft and enervated, instead of simple and free. This explains the longing for a return to nature. Perhaps Diogenes and Rosseau have something to teach the modern age. The manner in which, in the present problem of prohibition, men cry for liberty of appetite instead of a freedom from a habit which has brought untold woe, which is dangerous economically, and which breaks down life and health, is indicative of the lack of the liberty of love. There exists a corrosive individualism of appetite. "It is revealing

that when an American speaks of liberty's decay he has reference to his stomach rather than to his mind.''[3] This true statement by a modern liberal can be paralleled by the statement of a German preacher. In the exposition of the story of the rich fool, who said to his soul: ''Eat, drink and be merry,''[4] the preacher remarked drastically: ''The fool confused his soul with his stomach. He had a stomach-soul.''[5] Is this not true today, and is it not sad to find leaders, who to defend the impatient appetite of men, call their pleas arguments for liberty? Surely this is a sign of degeneration.

If we look into the history of morals, has there been an increasing liberation, or have there been periods of rise and periods of decay? Some virtues have arisen, and others have died out. Certain vices, like those attached to sex, have never ceased. Men often go from bad to worse, and then reform for a while. There is a constant downward drag. Liberty often lies not in the present and future, but in the past. Cruder conditions of manners in earlier ages are not proofs of a lower morality. A refined age in its literature, its painting, sculpture, and its music is frequently more corrupt morally, and less free, than an unsophisticated era. What is true of morals is true of religion.

---

[3] Will Durant, "The Mansions of Philosophy," p. 410.
[4] Luke 12: 16 ff.
[5] The original word is Bauchseele.

If we look into the history of religion the beginning is purer than the later stages. Polytheism with its naturalism is a growth from a few gods. In the purely natural development of religion gods are multiplied and not decreased. The world religions begin on a high level, but after a time reform is necessary. Religion like politics needs reform: the only difference is, that politics are reformed oftener, and stay reformed a shorter time, than the reforms of religion. Later Brahmanism is not like the simpler faith of the Vedas. Buddhism falls from the early teachings of Gautama. The original Christ is so often forgotten, that the cry arises: "Back to Christ." After the pure period of apostolic truth men soon make Christianity a new law. A simple brotherhood becomes a worldly organization during the centuries. The freedom of faith is rejected, and the compulsion of bans and inquisition takes its place. The right of individual judgment of the days of the Reformation is soon set aside. Men must believe what their prince believes. Liberals arise but they reject the messages of Christ and the apostles in the interest of a prevailing science or philosophy. The low ebb of eighteenth century rationalism and deism has not taught the so-called modern liberals that they are bringing about degradation instead of progress and essential liberty in evangelical truth.

It is very interesting to note that such an advocate of progress as Will Durant must admit

that there have been some earnest and wise advocates of the hypothesis of degradation. The optimism of the time of Condorcet is met by the admission of Machiavelli, that societies also decline. "'The development of humanity,' said Eckermann, 'seems to be a matter of thousands of years.' 'Who knows,' replied Goethe, 'perhaps of millions. But let humanity last as long as it will, there will always be hindrances in its way, and all kinds of distress, to make it develop its powers. Men will become cleverer and more intelligent, but not better, nor happier, nor more effective in action, at least except for a limited period. I see the time coming when God will take no pleasure in the race, and must again proceed to a rejuvenated creation.'—Disraeli was one of the first to sense the difference between increase in power and improvement in purposes. 'The European talks of progress because by the aid of a few scientific discoveries he has established a society which has mistaken comfort for civilization.' 'Enlightened Europe is not happy. Its existence is a fever which it calls progress. Progress to what?' Ruskin, a rich man, questioned the identity of progress and wealth: were those wealthy shopkeepers and shippers better specimens of humanity than the Englishmen of Johnson's or Shakespeare's or Chaucer's days? Carlyle and Tolstoi acknowledged the enormous advance in man's means for achieving his ends; but of what use were these unprecedented powers if they had merely multiplied the ability of men

to realize purposes as contradictory, as stupid, and as suicidal as ever before?'"[6] This testimony of many thinkers, that the world was not rolling into glory, confirms the belief that man has not lifted himself into liberty by the bootstraps of his own efforts. Spiritual freedom has not increased. May it not be true then, that the Jacob's ladder of liberty is not being built from the earth upward, but that at the beginning of mankind God had let it down?

The third possibility must reject the idea of man's moral and spiritual rise as the outcome of a material evolution. It will be closer to the romantic idealism of Milton without the insertion of elements of a later civilization. While the primitive man was hemmed in by nature, and had not yet discovered how to overcome its power and use it, he may have been spiritually free and morally unbound. His liberty was of course the inexperienced freedom of innocence. Whatever may have been the earthly connection of his body, as soon as he began to think, he could be able to speak, and name some of the animals about him. The absence of the simplest hut, the difficulties of food, do not prove that man could not be free in spirit, which is the true and ultimate liberty. We cannot picture how he looked, and we dare not place too much reliance on the few bones from which modern scientific

[6] "The Mansions of Philosophy," p. 362.

speculation has endeavored to reconstruct early man, even going so far as to assign a beard to him at a certain stage. This sort of museum picturing of the primitive man is more erratic than any poetic fancy of Milton. When Genesis portrays the first relation of man to woman as his helpmeet, this is certainly more normal than the idea that woman at the start was an ignorant half-animal being subdued by the cruel power of the cave man. Mind is not a unity with matter. This is still unproven, unless the idea of the connected functioning attempts to evade the question: "What is Mind?" The uniqueness of mind still allows thoughtful men to see in it the trace of the image of God. How can the moderns so exalt man, his intelligence, and his accomplishments, and at the same time reduce him to the material level? There is a great, unnoticed contradiction here.

The free Adam of Eden has remained a tradition among many people in some form or other. There is a certain value in these common traditions of creation and the flood. We cannot reject them as mere illusions, nor set aside the memory that looks backward as well as the hope that looks forward. Even Walter Lippmann must admit the importance of the golden age. "Indeed, so vivid," says he, "is this memory that for ages men took it to be an account of historical events;"[7]

[7] Why can it not be such an account, even if it does not fit in with modern evolutionism?

in absolute good faith they constituted for themselves the picture of a Golden Age, which existed before evil came into the world. . . The memory of an age of innocence has haunted the whole of mankind. It has been a light behind their present experience which cast shadows upon it, and made it seem insubstantial and not inevitable. Before this life there was another which was happier. And so they reasoned that what was once possible must somehow be possible again. Having once known the good, it was unbelievable that evil should be final.'"[5] Was this idea of mankind a fancy projected by poetic imagination, or was it a real, great memory? Why is the latter impossible? Those who reject the reality of man's original liberty only do so to produce a unified evolution, but they have no substantial proof.[6]

[5] "A Preface to Morals," p. 151.

[6] For a defense of man's freedom as against necessity, cf. H. W. Carr, "The Unique Status of Man," p. 180 ff.

CHAPTER V

The Cause of the Loss

It has become very customary in certain circles of the modern intelligentsia to make sport of, and even sneer at some Biblical stories. This is considered a sign of advanced and liberal thinking. And though there are many scholars who have some decent respect for the established religious beliefs of Christians, yet they too silently pass by, and in their minds actually reject, most of the early chapters of Genesis. The utmost that is allowed, even by modern theologians, under the spell of material evolution, is to classify the Genesis accounts with fairy tales, or allegories, or myths. Among the parts set aside as essentially valueless for the religious life, the story of the fall of man, and his loss of liberty that God had granted him, is very prominent. But if we examine the third chapter of Genesis with some care in an unprejudiced spirit we shall find that no matter whether our interpretation is literal or figurative, the psychology portrayed in the account of man's loss of his first liberty is correct. It is easily checked up in the experience of today, when we observe in the actions of men, and know from our own life, how sin enters, and how man falls into its snares and slavery. The meta-

physical inference about the origin of evil outside of man is likewise sustained when we balance the different possibilities. It becomes no absolute certainty, but, philosophically speaking, attains high probability.

In the consideration whence evil came, and how sin entered mankind, and took away its freedom, the problem of temptation first presents itself. Man in the liberty of his innocence could not escape a testing. An untried goodness is no vital virtue. We are only good and become virtuous, as in the experience of life we freely decide for the right. The liberty of the original gift was to be maintained and strengthened by the liberty tried and accepted by man. God could not make man free and good by compulsion. Freedom cannot be merely maintained, but it must ever and again be gained. Liberty is no safe and static possession, but it is rather a treasure to be constantly watched. It demands a constant, new grasp, and it can only be held when it is allowed to be a dynamic force. Its value must be realized out of living experience. A side-light may be used to show this character of liberty. In the Republic of Plato toward the close the vision of Er describes souls who chose their lot in heaven for their next life. Some come from heaven with no hard earthly experience; others have been in severe tests on earth, and they chose more wisely because of their former trials. Professor Frederick J. E. Woodbridge rightly interprets the in-

tended meaning, when he writes: "It was perhaps a little more than chance—perhaps the deliberate intention of Apollo's son,[10]—that the first choice fell to the soul from the sky, one whose former life had been spent under an ordered *politeia,* and the last to Odysseus. They were typical of contrasted disciplines. Like Adam and Eve, confronted with a choice, the soul from paradise fell and blamed others for his conduct. 'The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.' 'The serpent beguiled me and I did eat.' But the crafty old sailor, conscious of battles, wanderings, shipwrecks, and evils of men, looked to the future and chose gladly out of what he could find. Earth may be a preparation for heaven, but heaven is no preparation for earth.'"[11] Man must be cast into the alembic of trial and then freedom may be won in the test. This was the intention of God who gave liberty to man. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil represents the necessary test.

When the test comes the temptation is more than a trial for innocent freedom. It is made the occasion for the intrusion of the power of evil. It has been objected again and again that God was responsible in permitting Eve to be approached by Satan. Here lies the whole difficulty and mystery of the origin of evil. It must be

[10] He thus designates Plato.
[11] "The Son of Apollo," p. 100.

realized, however, that God could not create a free man without taking the risk of liberty. All freedom in the moral and spiritual world involves the possibility of the choice of right or wrong. And without freedom man would have been the kind of machine which some modern scientists aim to reduce man to. The only possible escape in this apparent fault on the part of God is given in the speculation, that God freely limited Himself when He made man and gave to him the boon of freedom. There remains, however, the problem of the power of evil over against the power of God. But the contest in the great drama of good and evil must be fought out spiritually and it cannot be solved by the assumption of mere suppressive power. In the light of all that God is, and all that He has revealed Himself to be through Jesus Christ, it is impossible to impugn Him in any manner whatsoever without making Him either finite or evil. And these ideas contradict His holy love.

Pantheism has always sought to meet the difficulty of sin and evil by making it simply a contrast to good. In the absolute totality the opposition is to be resolved. Evil is conceived of as partial good, and good as partial evil. Both are relative in a relative world. Another form of this philosophic pantheism is the modern evolutional pantheism. In this pantheism God is not above the process of the finite as infinite and absolute, but He is within the experience of man-

kind. Good and evil are then phases of the evolution of God in and through humanity. The objection to both of these kinds of pantheism is, that they minimize evil, and reduce it to a mere finiteness of part or process. But the facts of sin and evil are too positive and powerful to be explained as pantheism attempts to do. Sin is not mere partiality or negativity, but a strong, working actuality.

But if God must be exonerated of the charge of being responsible for the coming in of evil through temptation, perhaps the whole blame must rest upon man. Man certainly has a share of guilt through the acceptance of sin that enslaves. Is he, however, the originator? Can we suppose that man deliberately chose evil as his good? If his nature as created was free we cannot assume that man deliberately originated sin. There are, it is true, deliberate wrongdoers, but most men err through misleading and erroneous conceptions and imaginations. No doubt Socrates went too far, when he asserted that no man errs willingly. He thought that every one wanted the good, but that most failed in the choice of means that lead to the goal of the good. Schiller echoed this same idea, when he said, that man in his dark strivings is conscious of the right way. The partial truth of these assertions is, that man is not inherently and by his very nature a sinner. Sin is not the essence of man's moral and spiritual being. Evil and its consequent bondage are

not normal for man, but rather goodness and freedom. Again, if man alone originated evil out of himself, he must ever remain subject to it. There can be no redemption nor salvation. Man as radically sinful is not capable of any new life of righteousness. But as man can and does become righteous he cannot be unalterably evil.

With the possibility of God and man as authors of evil eliminated there remains only a third conjecture. Evil and its corruption must come from a non-human source which is not divine. And this source must be some sort of a personal spirit as good and evil do not really exist as abstractions, but only within spirits, within personal beings. Thus we come to the assumption of the Devil. But this remains no mere assumption, for it is attested in experience. The strongest proof is found in the temptation of Jesus. When He was approached to interpret His messiahship, either as an economic deliverance of man, or a magical exhibition of power to satisfy the hunger for the merely miraculous, or finally as the assertion of worldly glory and pomp irrespective of good or evil, He saw in these suggestions the presence of Satan. They can only be interpreted as dramatic thoughts rising within the mind of Jesus Himself, if at the time of temptation He is in contradiction with His whole life and death. What Christ experienced has been testified to by many believers as their experience. In various ways saints tell us evil thoughts were intruded

into their consciousness which they resented. And their life does not show that there is any other psychological explanation than a suggestion from without. Such a suggestion might come through other men, but often it arose without human instrumentality. The picture of the Devil was colored, it must be admitted, by the ideas of the age in which believers lived; but this does not destroy the probability of the fact back of the peculiar manner of imagining Satan. While there may be less of such experience today, this is due to two causes. First, men fear to attribute evil suggestions to its final source, Satan, because the Devil is made a joke in the modern world. Second, many people have become spiritually so lax and indifferent that no temptation is necessary for them. They are not with God, and they have lost true liberty in their thoughtless drifting, and therefore they need not be drawn away from God and freedom.

The psychological argument from experience is strengthened by the unity of evil. Christ thinks of evil in the terms of a kingdom (Luke 11:18). It is not mere individual slavery, but a social condition. While it may sometimes seem that evil is mere individual transgression of the law, yet a closer survey of facts shows common movements of evil. These are not apparently due to a deliberate human agreement, but they come about in the manner of subconscious influence. Criminal statistics demonstrate the rise and fall

of certain types of crime. Such a statistical tabulation would be impossible if there did not exist an underlying unity of sin. Sin is in the end destructive and disintegrating, but in its beginnings and initial operations it shows a constructive plan and process.

Another clue to the necessary assumption of the Devil is the devil-worship widely prevalent in many low religions. This worship may be construed as a sad obsession, which it truly is. But whence did it come? Could men have had the idea to placate the evil demons and devils if there had not been some common ruling, and widespread conviction of the terrible power of evil? It is not possible to prove that devil-worship is only the outcome of the fears and dreads of untamed nature. These are in part present, but there are also found the burdens of moral and spiritual guilt. The history of devil-worship is an additional clue to the confirmation of the idea that there is a Devil, from whom ultimately evil comes.

When we follow the story of how evil approached mankind we have before us an account whose phychological reality can be substantiated in the present day. Satan came to the woman and said: "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree in the garden?" (Gen. 3:1). The manner of this question exhibits the plan to raise doubt about the one prohibition of God. Underneath it lies the implied suggestion: "How could

the good God deny you any fruit of the garden? Did He not give you your full liberty?'' The reaction which even one forbidding command could awaken in free beings was well calculated. In our day the same subtle idea opposes every limitation and restriction of freedom interpreted as the unlimited right to want, and to get whatever we desire and long for. Life, we are told, must be kept rich and full. No conventions and rules of society, no moral or spiritual traditions of right or wrong, and least of all, no supernatural demand by a God dare interfere with the full enjoyment and liberty of any one. We are the masters of our fate, and we want to shape our life as we wish, cabined and confined by no prohibition of any sort.

Upon this first insinuation against goodness and God, Eve replies confirming the given law. And then the Devil cleverly makes a direct assault, and denies the consequences of transgression. ''Ye shall not surely die'' (Gen. 3:4). He completely negates the results of evil which God had warned against. He is ever the spirit who denies and negates the results of evil. Does anyone do the wrong, and indulge in the breaking of the right and good, with a clear notion of the consequences? Most transgressors are deceived, and then deceive themselves, with the idea that they can escape what may follow a misdeed. While it is perfectly clear that every cause has its effect, and that every moral or immoral act has its re-

sults, still sinners are deluded into the belief, that they will not suffer the threatened consequences. When wrongdoing begins as a first experiment it cannot at once produce such bad results as are pictured. It can be tried. But mostly what is tried once with impunity, is experimented with twice, and then the adventure becomes more bold. At last the consequences accumulate, and there is no escape. Wrongdoing becomes a habit, and an evil habit sows its own tares.

Satan continues: "For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened" (Gen. 3:5). The promise is given, that a new and larger wisdom will be gained through the adventure of evil. The inexperienced innocence of goodness is a narrow life. The forbidden fruit must be tasted, and then man will look out upon the world with new eyes. Actual knowledge comes through living in all the possibilities of life. What an alluring, enticing world of every kind of indulgence and passion exists, of which the simple-minded and good know nothing! The world of evil is a revelation. But whither does this revelation lead? As we enter into the seductions of evil do we remain mere spectators? Are we only on a slum-expedition? The deception lies in the suggestion that we can see evil, and not be tempted to do it. Why should free man fall?

This insinuation is followed by another sly suggestion, when Satan says: "And ye shall be

as gods'' (Gen. 3:5). In the enlargement of life and in tasting of wrong man is to become god-like. He will rise above his limitation which the liberty of goodness imposes upon him. Back of this thought is the hint, that God forbade the tasting of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil out of jealousy. He is afraid that men will rise up to Him. He must keep them down in the ignorant state of the simple, good people. It is remarkable that this idea of a jealous god entered into paganism. In Greek mythology Prometheus is forever bound to a rock because he had discovered fire. The gods do not want men to make discoveries that shall advance them. It is often said by the young, that the old people who warn them simply are averse to their wild escapades, because they are jealous of youthful vigor, and because they can no longer indulge in the sins of youth. How entirely true the psychology of Genesis is!

Finally the Devil promises men that they shall know good and evil (Gen. 3:5). Good and evil are made two coordinate experiences. The distinction between them is wiped out. They are purely relative to each other. The fact that evil enslaves, and only the good life preserves liberty is obscured and denied. With the abandonment of the conviction that the good life is the only real, free, happy life, the enslavement of sin is completed.

But the question now arises, how does man

react to the temptation? How is he entangled in the subtleties of Satan? At first Eve strongly states the divine prohibition; and she even adds to it, and apparently strengthens it, when she says: "Neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die" (Gen. 3:3). But this very effort shows, that she has already partly succumbed to the allurement of the evil, and that she tries to save herself by making the commandment more severe. The very severity, however, of a prohibition increases the desire to break the law that forbids. The attachment of harder and harder terms to a law betrays the fear that it cannot be kept without such bracing. But the very addition to a simple prohibition produces the reaction, and awakens the strong desire to transgress.

The half-yielding attitude of Eve is followed by the coming in of other motives. First, the desire rules. "The tree was good for food, and it was pleasant to the eyes" (Gen. 3:6). Only after the appeal to desire there comes the further consideration, that the tree was "to be desired to make one wise" (Gen. 3:6). This last profit of eating of the forbidden fruit was to be the after-effect of the indulgement in the desire. As man catered to the satisfaction of desire he was to grow in knowledge. The feelings were to liberate the mind. The desiring heart was to be stronger than the clear judgment of the head. Lust was the beginning of evil in man. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for

God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed" (James 1:13, 14). When the clarity of clear, cool consideration of facts gives way to the disturbing and restless desire with its continued urgings, then man begins to be caught in the snare of the hunter of souls.

It has sometimes been asked, what was the actual content of this enslaving desire? Was it the mere appetite for an apple?[12] Such might have been the case in the childhood of mankind, but the apple represents more than the apple. It is a test of obedience and the acceptance of divine authority. There was a sect among the Jews, called the Karaites, which interpreted the desire as the sex-lure. When Adam and Eve had eaten of the forbidden fruit "The eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons" (Gen. 3:7). One is at times inclined to accept this interpretation. Is it not true that the pristine purity, the unconscious cleanness of mind and heart, might have kept the sex-function in its right place? The unseemly

---

[12] "They say that it was because he (Adam) ate the apple that he was lost or 'fell,' but I say that it was on account of this assumption of his; this 'I' and 'me' and 'mine' and the like. Had he eaten seven apples he would not have fallen, but for his assumption."—*Little Book of the Perfect Life*, quoted by Egon Friedell, in "A Cultural History of the Modern Age," p. 141.

parts would have had permanent honor from God in the perpetuation of mankind. But desire arose and evil imaginations came. Shame was a sign that sex-allurement had taken the place of sex-unconsciousness. Man began to fall below the animal because he allowed his unbridled imagination to inflame his passion. The outcome in the sins of sex has been terrible, and who can adequately describe all the evil, physical and moral, that has followed from sex-indulgence. The modern novelists want to make us believe, that all life turns about the triangle. They glorify passion and put a crown of praise upon illicit love. Not only Helen of Troy but also Sir Galahad are painted in the lurid colors of wild passion.

But when all has been said, it still remains true that we can not derive all sins from sex. There are sins of the spirit and not of the flesh. While men often "deceive themselves in thinking that freedom from the flesh can be won by better organization of the flesh,"[13] they delude themselves still more when they stress the flesh as the only source of sin. If the flesh be made the only well from which the poisoned waters of wrong flow then man is by nature evil. Flesh as mere flesh is only evil when it is made thus. When the desire plays in upon the flesh then the evil spirit rules. It is a mistake to interpret Paul's usage of flesh as the human bodily life. With Paul, as with

[13] Woodbridge, "The Son of Apollo," p. 83.

John, flesh often means the whole evil tendency of man, and not his body. There are sins like pride, envy, jealousy, hate, and the like, which are just as wrong and enslaving as any bodily sin. We cannot justly attribute the rise of sin in man to his bodily enticements.

Whatever the form of the desire that misleads, it finally ripens into action through two other attitudes, disobedience and rejection of authority. Obedience is freedom in the days when childhood needs the ripe experience and guidance of its elders. Through wise obedience the way is opened for self-determining liberty. It was necessary in the childhood of the race that man should trust and obey the good and safe wisdom of God. But he allowed himself to be diverted by the evil suggestions of Satan. To this day obedience is tabooed by the modern man. He wants no divine will over his life. He fails to note that the doing of God's will and God's service is "perfect freedom." "Away," say the modern moralists, "with obedience." Man must express himself in his own way without hindrance and let. There is to be no repression nor any plucking out of the eye, nor any cutting off of the hand. Our age has no patience with all that Puritanism stood for. Puritanism may at times have been prim, prudish and pedantic. But it stood for a truth which is very valuable, namely, that life must also have self-control. Self-control is truer freedom than the modern self-indulgence. "In the legends of

heroes, of sages, of explorers, inventors and discoverers, of pioneers and patriots, there is almost invariably this same underlying theme of sacrifice and unworldliness. They are poor. They live dangerously. By ordinary standards they are extremely uncomfortable. They give up ease, property, pleasure, pride, place, and power to attain things which are transcendent and rare. They live for ends which seem to yield them no profit, and they are ready to die, if need be, for that which the dead can no longer enjoy. And yet, though there is nothing in our current morality to justify their unworldliness, we continue to admire them greatly.'"[14]

The strength of disobedience, and the unwillingness to submit to God's will in hope of greater liberty, is due to the rejection of all authority. Satan upset man's faith in God's just, loving and liberating authority. Authority of the right kind is no contradiction of freedom. Like obedience it paves the way for real liberty. Despite all human accretions to the moral law it must be kept in its essence. Sin and slavery result where the authority of divine love is cast aside. There exists a fundamental moral order for life, honor, purity, property, which cannot be broken without destroying the liberty of all society. There is need of an oughtness, a recognition of the obligation of duty, which cannot be abolished without

---

[14] Walter Lippman, "A Preface to Morals," p. 156.

setting men adrift upon the wild waves of lawlessness. It is a great mistake when the Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, to please the youth which desires to emancipate itself from the acknowledgment of binding duty and right, recommends the substitution of beauty in morals for the call of duty. The ancient Greeks did not rescue morals through the beauty of the good. The proposition of beauty as the motive for morals is not novel even in the modern world. Schiller and Shaftesbury sought this way. But thoughtful moralists soon recognized that an ethic founded on beauty would only appeal to æsthetic souls. But since these are rare there could be no appeal to all men. Men may continue to cry: "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us,"[15] and the answer will still come as of old, "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision."[16]

[15] Psalm 2: 3.
[16] Psalm 2: 4.

CHAPTER VI

The Consequences of the Loss

In the old and well-known missionary hymn "From Greeland's icy mountains, From India's coral strand" there occurs the oft quoted line, referring to India: "Where every prospect pleases, and only man is vile." The people of India rightly reject the strong epithet "vile" as applied to them despite the incidents told in "Mother India." If we modify this adjective "vile" somewhat, and extend the poet's line to all the world we shall have come closer to the truth. In a wonderful, glorious world, with its beauties and joy of nature, man, destined to enjoy and use it in gladsome liberty, is under the bondage of sin. Jesus said: "Whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin" (John 8:34).[1] In the face of this word, and forgetting that Christ gave His life as a ransom for men (Mark 10:45), and that He shed His blood for the "remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28), the English woman preacher, Maud Royden, has dared to say that Christ did not make much of sin. Such is the interpretation of modern sociological religion!

But what in detail are the consequences of man's loss of the liberty of righteousness? The first is the spread of sin. Eve "did eat, and gave

[1] Cf. Romans 6.

also to her husband with her; and he did eat" (Gen. 3:6). Just as the good spreads through contacts, so the evil possesses its contamination. Mankind is bound up into unity. It is a society, and society is constituted of men in their togetherness. What affects one will sooner or later affect others. But in the spread of sin each one has his responsibility. The tendency is, however, to put the blame on some seducing person. Adam said: "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat" (Gen. 3:12). "And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat" (Gen. 3:13). In part all are guilty, and each one has a share in the wrongdoing. But the fact of the common doing of sin has still other results.

Mankind is not only connected in its contemporaneous life, but also from generation to generation. To-day the physical basis of heredity is clearly established. Certain bodily traits are handed on from father to son throughout the years. The Austrian priest, Mendel, discovered the definite proportions in heredity in his experiments with peas. His results have been confirmed in all nature. They also exist in man, and have been established by the gathering of careful observations in normal and abnormal men. The eugenists contend that mental capacities, inclinations, and traits are also handed on. In view of these results, the old objections to the coming down of sin from one generation to another fall.

It is no longer improbable to hold that there is inherited, or original sin. The strain and lure toward evil, and the tendency to sin, is a common human inheritance. In addition, certain memories of the past, certain evil as well as good ideas, certain wrong as well as right actions, live on as a part of our historical burden, from which we cannot of ourselves emancipate ourselves. But this consequence of the contamination of evil through inheritance becomes individual and social by the re-endorsement of it, and the re-doing of it in every age, and by the individuals of every era. Sin and death "passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Romans 3:12). All have entered into the evil inheritance, and have added to it new burdens of guilt and sin, which will descend to the coming generations.

By the existence of sin, its temptation and seduction, in our environment through heredity men have sought an excuse. But we are guilty in adopting the hereditary sin. In the same manner we cannot escape the responsibility for yielding to the surroundings in which we live. It has become a common opinion among the modern intelligentsia, that environment acts upon us inevitably. Its causes are supposed to produce effects in us which it is not in our power to stay. Thus it has come about that historians, and sociologists, and moralists, endeavor to extenuate all deviations from the right in mankind as the result of certain social and economic conditions.

Man is not to be accused in any way, for he is the unwilling victim of his age and his times. In a prosperous and luxurious age he necessarily becomes indifferent to moral and spiritual appeals. When men and women see all about them the enjoyments and amusements of the rich, their indulgences and their wild life, how can they be expected to be human, and not want what others have? Is not the inequality of possessions and of opportunities in an otherwise rich land like ours an inescapable temptation for the underprivileged? Must they not only want, but also demand their share? The theories of a better distribution of goods, whether of a socialistic or communistic kind, necessarily grow out of present economic conditions. Crime also is the result, not only of a physically defective nature, but also of the influence of environment. The environment has become sinful through sinful man, and it presents great seductive allurements. Nevertheless with all the tendency toward evil in unregenerate man the surroundings are not finally a compelling cause of evil. But sin in environment is a consequence of the long past of wrong.

The loss of liberty began in part with desire of evil that seemed good, and the overbalance of desire has also remained as a result. There is a place for desire if it seeks the best things. But desire has become indiscriminate, and it wants what it wants, whether good or bad. Man caters to his desires and allows them to rule over him.

The outcome of the regnancy of desire is the unbalance of man's normal nature. The urge and pressure of wants, mostly material, drive him on. The emotional part of human nature, and the function of feeling, become dominated by lust. The cool judgment of the mind is set aside. From desire man rushes into action before balanced considerations of what the action is and involves can arise. There are, it is true, some who seek to suppress this overlordship of desire through the power of an iron will actuated by the intellect alone. But such natures suffer in return by stifling the good feelings and the helpful emotions. They conquer the uprising of desire for a time, and check its inroads. But they do so with the loss of those finer feelings and sentiments which should also form a part of a normal human life. Thus desire, whether it is allowed to rule, or whether it is opposed by strong will and calm intellect, throws man out of the balance of a free personality.

Desire also leads to rebellion against the moral precepts that would check it. But in the end the rebellion itself ends in *ennui,* and the rebels of desire become blasè. The rebel "has become involved in an elaborate routine of pleasures; and they do not seem to amuse him very much. He finds it hard to believe that doing any one thing is better than doing any other thing, or, in fact, that it is better than doing nothing at all. It occurs to him that it is a great deal of trouble to

live, and that even in the best of lives the thrills are few and far between. He begins more or less consciously to seek satisfactions, because he is no longer satisfied, and all the while he realizes that the pursuit of happiness was always a most unhappy quest. In the later stages of his woes he not only loses appetite, but becomes exceedingly miserable trying to recover it.'" Thus a modern radical truly analyzes the rebel of desire. The men and women who thus revolt against the good through the lust of wild adventure at last grow tired of their very rebellion. Desire becomes an empty apple of Sodom.

Another result of enslaving sin is selfishness. The gratification of desire is one side of selfishness. The real place of the ego must be determined by the right of individuality. There is a just place for the individual, with his separate endowments and talents, in the complex of society. The single being has a right to his existence. No one can deny the necessity and justice of self-preservation. But the right of the individual has been turned by sin into the wrong of individualism. Self-preservation has been exalted into selfishness. Self-assertion, self-emphasis, self-importance, self-glorification become the ruling motives. Where this occurs others are minimized and their right to their individuality is denied. The other man, and the neighbor, do

---

[3] Walter Lippman, "A Preface to Morals," p. 4.

not count. Individualism becomes a menace to the common good. This same proud, self-confident egotism also rejects all just law. No wiser word has been uttered than: "Sin is the transgression of the law" (I John 2:4). The heart of divine law is love. Love liberates, but selfishness enslaves the self and harms society. In the present impatience of youth, which is only accentuating the sins of the youth that is now old, there is a revolt against law. The opposition is in part against the hypocrisies and inconsistencies of the past, but in greater part it rebels against any supernatural sanction. In this attitude it is encouraged by radical scientists and liberal preachers. The egotistic, self-opinionated, and wholesale rejection of all divine law, and divine will, is considered to be progress. The wild individualism of a Stirner[8] is upon the throne, although this fact is not admitted. Our age of so-called liberty and independence is not free, but only caught in the meshes of the sinful exaltation of the individual who dares in his desires, and with his limited intellect, to despise the just and sane law of liberty through love. The times show men imprisoned in the fetters of their own enslaving egotism.

The threat which was attached to the transgression of the law, and to sin, was death. Now death was present in the world before the fall of

---

[8] Der Einzige und sein Eigentum.

man. Plants had decayed, and animals had perished. It was necessary that the world should not be cluttered up by the continuance of all living beings. Some had to die in the struggle for existence, that the better adapted might live. It would have been equally true of mankind, even if men had not sinned, that death had to make room for coming generations with new visions and new hopes. The world could not exist if it were peopled by Methuselahs. But through evil death gained a new meaning. Without the slavery of the wrong men might have passed from earth to heaven like Enoch. Translation would have taken the place of the struggle of death. But sin gave a sting to death. Where sin reigned spirits degenerated and decayed within.

Plato tried to prove the immortality of the soul by a number of arguments. Among others, he argued for its indestructibility because evil did not cause it to cease. Rust, said he, destroys iron, but evil does not cause the soul to die. The fallacy in this argument is the overlooking of the fact, that while the soul continues, which for Plato was identical with life, the spiritual inclinations, and the spiritual aptitudes of man do die out through sin. There is a cessation of the spiritual life. Another fact also deserves consideration. The sin of the fathers often brings about the death of the sons. Through an evil life germs of disease are implanted in the young life that is born. How often has an impure life of one

generation with its poison in the body brought untold woe, sickness and suffering, pain and agony, and an early death to a coming generation. Thus are the sins of the fathers visited upon the children.

The consequences of sin have been noticeable in all that is valuable to man. Sin has entered into human relations, and made what could be good evil. This is especially true in the relation of men to other men. The first and necessary good of man is his own life. It is a precious trust given to be administered in the hope of the eternal future. But how soon was life taken. Cain, the son of Adam, was the first murderer, and the progenitor of an increasing line of those who take human life. It is not only among people of low civilization that life is insecure. In fact, except in times of inter-tribal war, life today is safer in the wilds of the uncivilized tribes, than in the great cities of so-called Christian countries. The regard for the right of every one to his life has fallen very low. The rate of killings is on the increase, and it is out of all proportion to the growth of population. Even should the present disregard for life be partly overcome, murder will still continue. Men will be robbed of their right to live. But life is not only unsafe through the murderous assaults of other men, but individuals hold their own life cheap. It is not the cheapness of life in sacrifice for a great and noble cause, which is meant. But so little do men value

the gift of life, that under the stress of trial and misfortune they commit suicide. While some cases of suicide are the result of disease, it cannot be proved that this applies to all who take their lives. There is no faith in the hereafter, and no conviction that man is responsible to God for the keeping of his life.

Our age is slowly beginning to appreciate that war must be done away with. There is a growing ethical force which taboos war, not because of its economic destruction, nor the poverty which it causes, nor the bodily misery which it entails, but for the reason that it deals so cruelly with human life. It is a breeder of crime and murder. The noblest purposes of loyalty and devotion to one's own country, the willingness to protect the right, are called in, and then prostituted in the murder of men. Commerce and trade, science and art, are employed to accomplish the destruction of men. Long traditions of hate are aroused which live on to breed future wars and future slaughter of the strong and the young. Men revert to barbarism. In the wild orgy of battle they become brutalized, and commit horrible deeds, which they would repudiate, if they were not inflamed in the fire of battle, and constantly incited to deal with their fellowmen in war as with bloodthirsty beasts. War has been glorified despite the fact that it is the result of evil and the outcome of sin. The terrible hold which a sinful tradition has upon mankind is illustrated by war. All the

glorification of patriotism, and all the praise of heroism, by historians and poets, does not wipe away the bloody stain that rests upon mankind through war.

Among all the social forms which are necessary for the well-being of society none is more essential than the family. It is for the sake of the family, in which the early impressions of right are to be formed, and in which the first gentle influences of religion are to be felt in the atmosphere of love, that the problem of purity in the married estate is so important. The whole question of marriage and divorce has a bearing upon a sound and good society. No other agency can really take the place of the family and home. Neither the school nor the Church are adequate substitutes, no matter what they try to do to make up in the life of some children the loss of the home-life. In the best life men sought the sanction of religion for marriage and considered it a holy estate. Even Will Durant has one of his characters in a dialogue on God and immortality defend the religious view of marriage. "The religious solemnization of marriage not only glorified the event for the parties concerned, it welded them into wedlock by the emotional intensity and the reverential awe that religion cast over what otherwise would have been merely a license to cohabit; and in this way it made for the stability of the family, and therefore of the

State.'"[4] But what has become of this ideal in modern life?

The answer of the radicals is that economic conditions have changed marriage, and are destroying the family. Men and women are excused under the plea of the complexity of the age. Modern conditions are supposed to hinder successful marriages. The situation is thus described by Walter Lippman: "With the dissolution of authority and compulsion, a successful marriage depends wholly upon the capacity of the man and the woman to make it successful. They have to accomplish wholly by understanding and sympathy and disinterestedness of purpose what was once in a very large measure achieved by habit, necessity, and the absence of any practicable alternative.'"[5] Whatever truth there may be in this description it omits the fact, that through unbridled individualism, unbound passion, uncontrolled romanticism, and an unwillingness to bear each other's burdens, sin has crept in. It is finally not the difficulty of hard economic conditions, not mere prosperity and wealth, but evil thoughts and sinful desires which are undermining the family and killing the home.

Sin has produced like evil consequences in man's right to property, business, commerce and trade. In man's early existence the tribe held the ownership. When the time came that men as

[4] "The Mansions of Philosophy," p. 592.
[5] "A Preface to Morals," p. 311.

individuals could hold property it gave freedom to possessions and to occupations. But as the world advanced and new conditions arose the individual abused his liberty. Greed and avarice entered in, and men wronged each other in and through their possessions and their business, trade, and commerce. The evils which have crept in by the over-accentuation of individual rights in property and business are not the inevitable results of economic changes. It is so easy to excuse the greed of the manufacturers when the industrial age began. The machine of itself did not bring about the low wages, the misery, the health-destroying conditions of the early machine age. It was the evil of the desire for acquisition that brought so much woe into the individual right of property, and into business. "Acquisition may not be the most profound or intense of the instincts, but it is the most perennial. We tire of eating, or of playing, or of fighting, even of loving; but we seem never to tire of acquisition. Only the richest and the poorest are relatively free from it; between these extremes, all along the social line, the fever rages."[6] Through the sinful emphasis on acquisition capital becomes capitalism, and is not just to labor. But the reactions of labor, or socialism, or communism, are also not pure and saintly actions. "Corrupt, stupid, grasping functionaries will make at least

[6] Will Durant, "The Mansions of Philosophy," p. 482.

as big a muddle of socialism, as stupid, selfish, and acquisitive employers can make of capitalism. There is no escape from this elementary truth, and all social policies which attempt to ignore it must come to grief. They are essentially Utopian. The early doctrine of *laissez-faire* was Utopian because it assumed that unregenerate men were destined somehow to muddle their way to a harmonious result. The early socialism was Utopian because it assumed that the same unregenerate men, once the laws of property had been altered, would somehow muddle their way to a harmonious result. Both ignored the chief lesson of human experience, which is the insight of high religion, that unregenerate men can only muddle into muddle.'"[7] In other words, it is sin which causes economic evil. It is sin which turns nations against each other, and hurries them into war, in the competitions of trade and commerce.

The slimy trail of the serpent that infested paradise is also found in art and religion. Art which was given man to lead him to ultimate beauty has often been depraved. Literature dwelt in the huts of the ungodly, and sat where the sinners sit. It sought spice and thrill at the expense of truth and righteousness. Poetry descended from the noble heights of Parnassus, and sang the song of the slums and of sin. Music left its high estate and catered to the low and to the pas-

[7] Walter Lippman, "A Preface to Morals," p. 250.

sionate desires of a depraved taste. Instead of purifying heart and mind, it enkindled passion. Religion, which was given to inspire us through the love of God to love each other, was depraved by bans, persecutions, and inquisitions. Its truth became hard and dry. It built up mighty, worldly organizations that enslaved men. When liberty rebelled and reformation came, it, too, soon crystallized into hard and f a s t intellectual dogmas. The right of individual judgment, and the justice of true toleration were traduced by the liberals, and used to undermine all faith under the plea of a free religion. Thus the noble and redeeming possibilities of religion were made of no effect. Men gravitated to and fro between a persecuting orthodoxy and a destructive heterodoxy. God was not honored either by conservative or liberal, by fundamentalist or modernist.

PART III

THE RESTORATION OF LIBERTY

CHAPTER VII

Christ, the Restorer

It is in the restoration of liberty that we come to the very heart of Christianity. Its conception of the free God is basic to His plan of restoring to man the lost liberty. All that Christian truth presupposes in creation and providence, and what it takes over from the Old Testament about man's first estate and his fall into sin, is introductory to the understanding of the necessity for the recovery of vital freedom. But what this restoration of liberty means for man, and how it is effected, is not an abstract problem of a process of deliverance. It centers in a personality. Christ, the revealer of the free God to man, is also the Redeemer. Prior to the consideration of how Christ makes us free, we must see Him in His own complete liberty.

The personality of Jesus has been approached from many angles. Some look at Him solely in the light of the glory which He had with the Father before the world was.[1] They see it sending out its beams from time to time even in the human servant. Others cannot find in the Christ more than a son of man, subject to all the limita-

[1] John 17: 5.

tions of human nature, although He is highly exalted above all men in the perfection of His character. To still others He is the enemy of capital, and the first great socialist. But He has rarely been appreciated from the point of view of His own, inner freedom, and its implications for His work of recovering true liberty for man.

Christ stands in His own age above all the religious groups. He cannot be classed with any one set of Jews. The Pharisees, in their origin defenders of essential Judaism, conservators of the law and prophets, and enemies of all destructive liberalism, did not attract Him. He was too large and free to bind Himself by their many legal deductions, their multitudinous quibbles and discussions. He saw through their evasions and hypocrisies. Their leadership had been detrimental to Judaism, and, instead of a liberating faith, it had imposed upon men many burdens hard to be borne. A free spirit had to revolt against the restrictions which Pharisaism imposed. But Christ could also not align Himself with the liberal Sadducees. Living as He did in the enlarging spirit of the great Old Testament prophets, it was impossible for Him to be satisfied only with the Law. He penetrated the contradictions of a liberalism, which on the one hand claimed to adhere only to the basic law of Israel, and on the other hand rejected the later developments of the hope of eternal life. Free in their attitude of life, the Sadducees had become men

of the world. Their non-progressive radicalism brought about a rift in the soul. At the same time that they rejected the limitations of Pharisaism, they also cast aside the marvelous messages of their noblest prophets of the past. They were bound by their very protest, and they were not really free in all their liberalism.

A third Jewish group is not mentioned in the New Testament, but we find an account of it in the Jewish historian, Josephus. The Essenes were the anchorites of Judaism. They lived secluded, monkish lives, and avoided the contaminations of the world. Abstinence and repression of life was their ideal of goodness. The flight from the marts of men was to be the guarantee of godliness. But Jesus did not narrow down His life to negations. He possessed His soul in the midst of men. When He retired from the pressure of the crowds to be alone at night in prayer, it was not with the purpose of permanent withdrawal from men. He returned with renewed strength and spiritual vigor to live a life of helpful service, in which, with all the spending of Himself to bear the ills and woes of men, He was nevertheless entirely the master of His soul.

The liberty of Christ was also a freedom from the trammels of traditionalism. In His age the followers of the Jewish religious leaders were very much hemmed in by the restrictions of many commandments that went far beyond the requirements of the ten words. Among His early con-

tests with the scribes and Pharisees was the contention about fasting (Mark 2:18 ff). The new wine of the joyous life of spiritual rescue and redemption could not be poured into the old skins of traditional prohibitions. The amount of fasting, and its strict observance, were no measure of vital religion in the eyes of Jesus. The various washings and ceremonial cleansings, as indicative of holiness, found no favor before the Christ. He knew that only what came out of a man defiled him (Mark 7:15). Bondage and freedom were matters of the heart. The perversion of the honor due a father and a mother through bringing a gift to the altar, called Corban, Christ rejected. There were many Sabbath laws which He could not accept as binding. He would not condemn His disciples for plucking ears of corn as they passed through the fields on the Sabbath. It was altogether wrong in His view to put off the help and the healing of sick and broken spirits because it was the Sabbath day (Mark 3:1 ff). Wherever the reconstruction of life was in question there was but one duty. Jesus completely cast aside all the hindering prohibitions of Pharisaic law, not because He was an anarchist of real law, but for the reason that He, the Son of man, was lord of the Sabbath.[3] With entire freedom He was above all small human restrictions. He had come to fulfill the actual law of God (Matt. 5:17), but He was not subservient to

[3] Mark 2: 28.

man-made prohibitions. He possessed the lordship of liberty over the Sabbath.

Because Christ was not subject to traditionalism He was no defender of legalism. He did not find the way of life in the law. None of the genuine law could remain unfulfilled (Matt. 5:18), but man could not fulfill it. When legalism ruled men believed that they could measure up to the standard of the right. But in this they deceived themselves and drifted into externality of observance. Thus they missed the spirit of the law and were under its letter. This was the error of the rich young ruler, who claimed that he had kept the commandments (Matt. 19:20), while he was not willing to do the deeds of sacrificing love. He did not catch the spirit of love as the essential foundation of all commandments. When Jesus unfolded the inner meaning of the law against murder, and against adultery, He thrust thoughts inward into the attitude and intent behind all action (Matt. 5:21 ff). The free Christ, judging all things by their inward spirit, was no legalist in the utter liberty of His life, and He did not encourage men to walk by the law. As long as they could not keep the law in its essential purpose they were bound under it as a mere external obligation. The Christ of liberty rejected such slavery. He could live within the spirit of the law, and was free because it was His own will to do so, and not an unwilling yoke put upon Him.

There was a party among the Jews known as the Herodians. This group was friendly to the Roman rule, and courted favor with Herod and his minions. It was a worldly set of men which disregarded the precious religious inheritance of the Jews. They looked upon every question from the political point of view. In opposition to them the rest of the Jews maintained their religious birthright and their patriotism by secret opposition to Rome. Some of them, known as the Zealots, became open revolutionaries and engaged in plunder and murder. Jesus could not be drawn into this political problem (Matt. 22:21). He did not disavow the Roman rule under which the Jews were, but He stressed the obligations that were due to God. His mission was not political nor economic (Matt. 4:4). It was His purpose and aim to change the world from within. He could not be entangled into any world problems of political power through any promise of glory (Matt. 4:8 ff). It was this soberness of self-control, and of a thorough grasp of His work, that prevented Him from becoming enmeshed in political questions. Because He did not mingle into the world movements of an economic and political sort He maintained His spiritual loftiness, and could bring deliverance to all forms of society by demanding the inner change of spirit, which is after all the final cure. The remedy from without has never been fully effective nor lasting. As little as He was a political reformer

so little was He willing to be made a king to furnish bread to men (John 6:26), and to divide inheritances (Luke 12:13 ff).

Goethe somewhere says, that in limitation a master appears. The power and ability to limit oneself is the outcome of real liberty. Jesus showed this self-possession, not only as over against the political entanglements of His day, but also as over against national narrowness. He knew that His direct and immediate call was to Israel, unless exceptional faith challenged Him as did that of the Syrophenician woman (Mark 7:24 ff). By intensive work in Galilee, and through the preparation of the twelve (Mark 3:14 ff), He laid strong foundations. But when His journey took Him through Samaria he was not hindered by Jewish or Samaritan prejudices from seeking the soul of the Samaritan woman, nor from preaching to all who came out to hear Him from the city of Samaria (John 4:4 ff). In the limitation of His ministry to the Jews, with a few exceptions, Jesus in His final outlook was no mere Jew. He knew that other sheep than those of Israel would enter His fold (John 10:6). All men would be drawn to Him when He would be lifted up (John 12:32). It is wrong to make Jesus so much of a Jew that His world-outlook is forgotten.

The modern tendency is to reduce Christ to the measure of a wise Syrian peasant, and to conceive of Him as thus limited. While He grew up

in the circle characterized by the simple life of Joseph and Mary, the carpenter and peasant folk of Nazareth, He outgrew the limits of His early home. It is true that the simple faith of the quiet people, like Zacharias, Elisabeth, Simeon, and Hannah, with whom Mary and Joseph associated, was fed more by the messages of the prophets than shut in by the demands of laws and commandments. Jesus breathed this freer air, away from the ecclesiasticism of Jerusalem. But He rose above His mother even in the days of His youth (Luke 2:49). She could not command Him in His work (John 2:1 ff). The circle of His home (Mark 4:31 ff), and His very brethren, did not believe in Him (John 7:5), excepting His mother, who kept His sayings in her heart (Luke 2:51). All this evidence proves that He was not the mere child of the religion of His earthly, early home. His spirit was free from all such hampering influences of His surroundings. He possessed the breadth and wideness of utter and complete liberty.

It is remarkable how Jesus stood as lord within nature. He was not a mere observer of the flowers of the field, and the fowls of the air, and drew lessons from them (Matt. 6:26 ff); but He was altogether master of the inner movements and processes of nature. The apocryphal stories of His youth exaggerate this power, and reduce the unfolding child to a playing God. He was supposed to have commanded the palm trees to

bend down with their fruits when His parents journeyed to Egypt with Him. It is related that He made small birds of clay, clapped His hands, and they arose as little, live singers of the air. Beautiful as these stories are as legendary imaginings, they are not true to the free Christ becoming a human child by His divine will. But Christ did show His power when He stilled the waves and allayed the raging storm (Mark 4:36 ff). His was a power not of ordinary man. No fear possessed Him, as He ruled the world from within. "Without Him was not anything made that was made."[3] The deaf and the blind were healed by Him; and the insanity of the possessed was overcome and conquered (Mark 5). In the presence of death He was unafraid. The daughter of Jairus was raised from the death-bed (Mark 5:22 ff). The young man, who was being carried out to the tomb, was given back alive to his mother (Luke 7:11 ff). Lazarus was called forth when decay had begun in the grave (John 11).

This commanding rule of Christ often is denied altogether as legendary, but such a negation is difficult in the light of every claim that Jesus truthfully made for Himself. He was no miracle-monger who delighted in the marvelous. His wonders were signs and lessons. To eliminate them we must cut out many incidents of the gospels, and reduce them to the small amount of

[3] John 1:3.

ethical teaching, which Thomas Jefferson allowed to stand in his revised New Testament. Those who to-day eliminate some miracles and keep others are inconsistent. All that is miraculous, and even the resurrection, must be denied as a fact. Then we will arrive at the position of Harnack, who years ago in his book "Das Wesen des Christentums" only admitted that the disciples believed that Jesus had arisen. The fact itself was inconsistently passed by, and the difficulties of such a belief developing in the saddened hearts of the twelve were not weighed. The whole nature of illusions was left unexamined. The impression of the whole, and not the minimized Christ, is that of utter liberty over nature.

A wonderful proof of the utter freedom of Jesus was His sinlessness. His challenge to His enemies: "Which of you convinceth me of sin" (John 8:46), has never been answered. He cannot in any sense be classed among men in their burdens of sin, and in their load of transgressions even though He associated with sinners (Luke 15:1, 2) to save them. He has at times been charged with impracticability, and with the attitude of a dreamer in a practical world. This accusation, which has largely arisen in the Western world, bases its proof upon the advice of Jesus not to resist evil, not to injure eye for eye and tooth for tooth, but to return good for evil, and to turn the left cheek when the right is smitten. These words of the Sermon on the

Mount are cited as evidence of the failure of Jesus to understand a belligerent world of self-defense. Some also think that Christ was too other-worldly, and too disregardful of the necessity of wealth. But when we notice what evil results have always followed the attitude of fight, and what are the temptations of wealth, and how Mammon crowds out God, we are not so ready to call Jesus an impracticable idealist. We can only hope that men will some time realize how much better the world would be, if men lived according to the truths of the Sermon on the Mount. Because Jesus was without sin, and because no sin really has been charged against Him throughout the centuries, we are ready to accept His freedom from death even though He passed through it for our sake.

The resurrection of Jesus is the proof that He had power to lay down His life, and to take it up again (John 5:26; 10:18). The life of Jesus, even in His human existence, was in His own control. It is a mistaken notion when the foretelling of His death by Christ (Matt. 16:21) is set aside. Some modern commentators try to prove that Jesus was not clearly conscious of the outcome of His ministry, and that until His last few earthly days He did not realize that He would be rejected. How, in the continued experience of opposition, and in the enmity that He met, could He hope aught else than happened to Him? He was not caught in the force of circumstances.

His death did not occur, but He chose to suffer it. Jesus was not overtaken by surprise in the garden of Gethsemane. The tumultuous reception accorded Him by Galileans when He last entered Jerusalem, did not obscure His clear knowledge of what would happen. He had deliberately set His face toward Jerusalem, and went up knowing what awaited Him (Matt. 20:17 ff). With utmost self-possession and strong calm courage, He faced His end. Men might crucify Him, but He would rise again. The Christ never speaks of His death without including His resurrection. The whole New Testament must be dismembered and rearranged, if all the evidence of Christ's complete liberty over His own life is to be removed. Socrates drinks the hemlock with a certain calmness. Does Christ rank below him, or does He rise preeminently above the Athenian philosopher? If His whole life and all His deeds, and all His words, elevate Him high above the best of usual men, why doubt and deny His ultimate power of the free disposition that He makes of His life?

Finally, the liberty of Christ appears in the fact of His becoming flesh. He was not forced into life by ancestry, but He came freely as the gift of the Father, and as the free self-gift of His own will. It is a sign of the liberty of the infinite, absolute Son of God, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, that He entered into finite life, and took upon Himself the form of a

servant. It was a sign of freedom that He laid aside His divine power on earth (Phil. 2:4 ff). He was not the slave of either a divine or human nature, but the full and absolute master of His personality. Christ entered from eternity into history to remake it. But this whole descent of the eternal Son is no mere metaphysical speculation. It is not intended as a movement of a Logos, like that of Philo, out of an absolute existence. Christ is not one of the outflowing logoi, or zyzigies of the Gnostic speculators. The whole end and aim of the Son in leaving His heavenly throne is to rescue man, and to restore to man his lost liberty. The purpose of the freely willed incarnation is the practical one of redeeming men from sin, and restoring their first, glorious estate of freedom. The incarnation is not a process, but a personal decision constantly upheld by the personal, freely controlled will of Christ. In God there was liberty. He was free, and acted freely as creator and preserver of the world and of mankind. But man lost liberty through sin. His personality became enslaved through the desire and act of the evil. But now the personality of the everlasting, divine Son comes to reestablish liberty, and to make possible anew to man what had been given him at the beginning of the race. From divine personality to divine personality goes the way overcoming human loss. Christ was not the man who dared to be God, but God who deigned to be man. But how did Christ

restore man to freedom? How did He recover the lost liberty? This question must be answered as we turn to the consideration of the work of restoration.

CHAPTER VIII

The Work of Restoration

In his great drama Faust, Goethe speculates on the words with which John begins his gospel, "In the beginning was the Word." As he rings the changes upon it, he says: "In the beginning was the Deed." The Logos does not remain mere utterance, but He becomes action and deed. This creative Logos that made the world becomes flesh. Deed again follows word. And if we are to make the effort to understand how the free eternal Word, the incarnate Christ, accomplished the restoration of liberty for man we must enter upon that phase of His earthly work upon which our spiritual freedom ultimately rests. This is the most necessary task to give us the assurance, that the liberation effected through Christ is the most desirable boon that we can ask for.

It has become a prevalent view that whatever liberty comes to us from Jesus must be the result of His teaching. No doubt can exist in any mind about the great power and influence of the teaching of the greatest of all masters. He is the Master. With the utmost sincerity, and without any concealment, He utters the saving truth. The worth of His sayings and teachings does not depend upon their effort to demonstrate the spir-

itual reality intellectually. The appeal of Christ is still less to the mere emotions and feelings. No arousement is contemplated. He created a sensation although He was no sensationalist. His method was not the dramatic appearance, or the burning words of John the Baptist. The proclamation of the truth which Jesus taught and preached came from no human theology, and through no man-made philosophy. He can well say: "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen " (John 3:11). The direct vision of the spiritual reality, and the unmediated knowledge of the everlasting essence of all being, were in the possession of Jesus. All that He said had the earmarks of ultimate truth. Wherever He touched, either upon the things of heaven or of earth, every utterance had the stamp of inescapable truth. His teaching was not the dry, academic discussion of fine points of the law; it had none of the scholastic splitting of hairs, or the scribal debating of trivialities about it.

The common people heard Him gladly, because they sensed reality and fact in His discourses. It was novel in a day of set ways of expounding the minutiæ of the law. When Christ spoke to the masses of men He used the marvelous pictures of life found in the parables. They are choice vignettes of actual human experience. Unfortunately many never asked about the inward meaning, but simply clung to the earthly illustration. Their obtuseness did not move them to

inquire after the mysteries of the Kingdom (Matt. 13:10 ff). When Jesus spoke to the Twelve He entered into the deeper truths in the manner which John has preserved for us. It is pure and unfounded speculation which attributes the difference of John's report of the sayings of Jesus to John's theology. This is supposed to have altered the simple words of Christ as found in the synoptics.

The content of Christ's teaching was mercy, grace, and love. He came with blessings and beatitudes. But the hypocrisy and formalism, the misleading guidance and empty proselyting of the Jewish leaders He castigated with fiery, holy indignation. In these denunciations the lightning and thunder of truth are revealed, but withal there is no hatred or bitterness of spirit in the strongest characterizations of Christ. They simply reflect the eternal glory of holiness. What Jesus teaches in its final analysis is Himself. He is the truth (John 14:6). Every real and great teacher is such because of his personality. Not what a live teacher teaches is ultimately permanent; but what remains is the impress of his character and person. Jesus had this marvelous gift of an inspiring personality, but, beyond it, He had the content of His truth in Himself. And yet, after we have made the utmost of the teaching of Jesus, and do not restrict it to the Sermon on the Mount, nor overstate the similarity of some of the sayings of Christ to rabbinical utter-

ances, we have not come to the real liberating deed. While even the commandment of love becomes a new commandment with Him, even thus He does not free us from sin. We are not lifted out of the bondage of evil by the teaching Christ, important as His doctrine is.

The modern emphasis is put on the life of Christ often with a distinct disavowal of the value of His sufferings and death. Such an estimate is in keeping with the present point of view, which exalts action and life. A pragmatic and realistic age wants to be rescued through the doing, and not through the suffering of life. It disparages belief in the interest of service. Life and work loom larger than faith and love. It is true that the life of Jesus, even apart from His suffering and death, is beyond all other human lives. It is altogether pure and holy, and yet it stoops to the lost and outcast, to redeem them by tender and sympathetic love. An aristocrat in sinless perfection, Jesus is a democrat in His estimate of all men. Utterly free He has the deepest understanding of those bound in sin. In the possession of utmost power He yet is the gentlest of men. Lowly and meek of heart there is in Him no depreciation of His divine reality. Living as a servant, and washing the feet of His disciples, He is nevertheless fully conscious of the eternal glory that He had with God before the world began. The greatest paradoxes are harmony and unity in His character. There is no unbridged

gap in His spirit, and no rift tears apart His soul. The longer we study Him honestly the more the mystery of His surpassing life enthralls us.

But how can the contemplation of this life make us free? It presents an unreachable ideal. We may strive to imitate it, but we cannot approach it at all. The greatest of saints falls far below the sinless Christ. The effort to approximate our lives to that of Jesus is very laudable, but it depresses us by its constant failure. It is an idle recommendation to promise us liberty if we strive to follow in His footsteps. Often this imitation of Christ becomes an externality. We cannot reduplicate the positions in which He was put, and, above all, we cannot act as He did in any instance with full confidence. His spirit must animate us. But at present such abuse is made of following and expressing the spirit of Christ by modern men, who repudiate the words and the whole of the life of Christ, that we are made dubious when we hear this advice. Often the spirit is the erratic spirit of man, and not the perfect spirit of Christ which is exhibited. The spirit of Christ can only come to us when we allow the whole Christ to inspire us. But this inspiration will not deliver us from the bondage of sin and the slavery of evil, until we are ready in all humility to accept all that the humiliation of Christ implies. We must have all of the Christ, labor and suffering, life and death.

It is an important fact that the early Christian

tradition, which was orally handed on before accounts were written down, gave large room to the last earthly week of Jesus. And the first synoptic documents are as full of the suffering and dying Christ as John. Was it simply the deep impression of those last days, and especially of that sad Good Friday, which caused them to be so well remembered? Or did Paul not evaluate rightly the suffering and death of Christ in the sense of the very first followers of Jesus? It is only when we return honestly to the real historic record without eliminations, and revert to the sound apostolic tradition, that we can find the clue to the liberating work of Christ with its restoration for man of vital, spiritual freedom.

The first problem that presents itself in the work of redemption is that of suffering. The best introduction to this question is some analysis of the meaning of that mysterious and intriguing book of the Old Testament, called the book of Job. In it we see the struggle to explain why the innocent suffer. The friends of Job attempt to charge him with some special guilt and some hidden, but outstanding sin in view of his continued visitation with evil. But he honestly rebels, and his conscience does not accuse him of a great sin and a marked transgression. Suffering, therefore, is no index of special wrongdoing. This much of truth is established. Jesus confirms it in the case of the blind man who did no peculiar wrong, nor was he punished for the sins of his

parents (John 9:2 ff). The Galileans, whose blood Pilate shed, and the eighteen men upon whom the tower of Siloam fell, were not sinners above all men (Luke 13:1 ff). The suffering of Jesus in the light of His life cannot be accounted as a personal punishment for great sin.

There is another element in the suffering of Job which needs consideration. He is also charged with human imperfection through which all of us deserve chastisement. While Job will not admit this truth, nevertheless it has its value for our common humanity. Chastisement is divine education through suffering, and in it we learn endurance, patience, gentleness, and quietness of spirit. Of course the unbelieving rebels, and those who have least sought God, accuse Him most bitterly. But chastisement is not an appropriate solution in the life and suffering of Jesus. While He learned obedience "by the things which he suffered" (Hebrews 5:8), it was the increase of obedience already possessed, and not the necessary chastisement of one who needed it. In the perfection of His character He was free from the necessity of chastisement.

When Job began to be afflicted he praised God. "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away. Blessed be the name of the Lord" (Job 1:21). In this attitude he did not sin, as he did later when he cursed the day of his birth. His faith in God did not waver. Such loyal belief was a testimony against the evil slander of Satan, that

Job only held to God because God had prospered him in every way, both in goods and family. Suffering was a sermon before men, and a refutation of Satan at the beginning of Job's hard trials. When Satan, as the dramatic story continues, moved God to smite Job with terrible disease, Job, under this last and sorest visitation, broke down in his witness to God's goodness. *But Christ never failed!* His suffering was also a testimony of how the utmost hatred of men could not make Him bitter, for He prayed: "Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34).

The whole innocence and purity of the heart of Jesus appeared in His suffering. In all honesty He could not admit any guilt in His trial before the high-priest, but He kept silent until compelled to testify to the return of the Son of Man in glory and power (Matt. 26:24). The testimony of the suffering Christ, a testimony of complete innocence and righteousness, which even the statements of lying witnesses could not destroy, brings again to the fore the same question, which the book of Job does not really solve for us in the emphasis upon God's mysterious power,[1] namely: "Why do the righteous suffer?"

What remained unanswered in Job can be asked again, and in the fulfilling Christ we may be able to find the answer to this perplexing question.

---

[1] Otto, "Das Heilige."

It is not an answer for sinful man, but a reply only in the case of the really innocent, sinless Christ. The solution is given when we analyze the sufferings and death of Jesus in the light of the meaning of sacrifice.

There is no outstanding religion in which sacrifice does not play an important part. Even in many primitive religions it is present. Sacrifice is not of one kind, for there are several sorts of sacrifice which must be clearly distinguished in their meaning and import. One kind is the sacrifice which is improperly called thus. It consists in oblations and offerings of gifts to God. These may be natural products or the work of man's hands. Fruits and animals are offered as evidences and signs of gratitude. In early religions the gods were supposed to be eager for these human gifts. They were imagined to hover like flies over the smoke of the gifts offered up in the fire, and to smell the savor as of sweet incense. Pleasure filled the gods in the reception of the gifts. This crude notion passed away. In the religion of Israel the first fruits offered up and the animals burned in sacrifice, were real acknowledgments of thanksgiving to God for His goodness, and His many mercies in things temporal and spiritual.

The offerings of gratitude become more of a real sacrifice when men surrender something that really hurts. It is an utter pretense to call the temporary abandonment of some luxury during

Lent, or the foregoing of some pleasure, a sacrifice. With such sacrifices God is not well pleased. There must be some real and actual giving up of what is essential to man. It cannot be the surrender of some secondary object, or some really unnecessary thing. The vital spirit makes an object given to God, whether it be money or any other gift, of worth. Irenaeus rightly says: "Sacrifices do not sanctify a man, for God is in no need of a sacrifice; but the conscience, being already pure, sanctifies the sacrifice and causes God to accept it from a friend.'"[3] The best sacrifice of gratitude that a man can bring is his bodily and spiritual life. Paul implores the Romans thus: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (Romans 12:1). Christ presented Himself in the highest degree to God for us, teaching us true gratitude. But it is not this sacrifice which redeems. In man it can only follow his restoration to the liberty of a child of God.

There is a sacrifice on behalf of a noble cause, or for one's fellowmen, which is the outcome of the surrender of life in love. Not all human giving in love ends in death, although it is a continuous and willing sacrifice. A mother's love of the true sort is such a constant surrender.

---

[3] Adv. Haer., IV, 18, 3.

One may live a life altogether for others in real self-forgetfulness, and there are some noble examples of such giving up of one's own desires and pursuits. For a great cause, for country, or Church, men have counted all other things as loss. But the striking cases of such sacrifice of love are those in which men, holding their life cheap through some noble motive, freely give up their life. When the games in the Roman Colosseum continued far into the Christian period, a monk, called Telemachus, cast himself into the arena, and suffered death. His sacrifice put an end to the old Roman practises. This was an actual sacrifice of life in love for the sake of righteousness and humanity. To rescue one who is drowning, to incur the danger of deadly infection, to brave destructive epidemics[3] to heal and cure men, to submit in a laboratory to tests that endanger life in order to discover some cure for men,—all of these cases are real sacrifices. The so-called sacrifices of war may be given in a right spirit, and no one should detract from their valor and despise their courage. But they are given in the mistaken belief of the inevitableness of war, which rests upon sin and not upon righteousness.

However, all of the human sacrifices, noble as they are, do not possess any redeeming value. It is utter paganism to think that individuals

[3] A famous instance is that of Walter Reed and his companions.

who surrender their life in loving sacrifice, cleanse themselves from their transgressions. Their death brings blessings to men, but it does not free them from the bondage of evil. But the death of Christ is a liberating power of divine love. In Him God relates Himself to us, and calls us to Himself, that we might be free. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them" (II Cor. 5:19). The mighty, seeking, saving grace of the heavenly Father is set forth in the sacrifice of Jesus. We dare never overlook this approach of God to us. He that first gave us liberty, which we men lost, is again offering it to us in the gift of His own Son. God gave His only Son not only into human life, but also into death. And Christ freely co-operated in this giving. How great a love is this, and while we were yet sinners, Christ died on our behalf! The cross cannot be fully understood, if it does not speak to our souls of the unfathomable love of the Father and the Son. This love is for our liberation, and it takes away our sin.

But there is still another element to be included in the sacrifice of love. In many religions there was a sacrifice for sin and for trespasses. Men not only brought lambs and goats and oxen to be killed, in order that somehow the blood that was shed might appease the gods, but even children were sacrificed. The thought back of such sacrifices was the appeasement of the wrath of

the gods. Men felt that they had forfeited their lives because of evil. Then they brought representative lives in place of entering into death themselves. In Judaism these bloody sacrifices for sin were required to be animals without blemish, prefiguring the sacrifice of the perfect for the sinful. Jesus came not merely to exhibit divine love, but He also bore the punishment for the sin of the world. He was "the lamb of God" (John 1:36). His crucifixion was the sign of a curse (Gal. 3:13). Man's sin had broken the law of love, and incurred the penalty of the "curse of the law" (Gal. 3:13).

There is an inescapable moral order in the world. When it is kept it guarantees human freedom. The breaking of it must be rectified. If men are to be free in the world of men and of society, there can be no loose handling of the right. The moral feature in all punishment must be the defense and protection of the necessary moral order. Reform ought to be added, but it cannot take place in the transgressor until he is willing to take a different attitude toward the law of righteousness. Jesus drank the bitter cup (Matt. 26: 38 ff), and suffered even the loss of the presence of His Father (Matt. 26:46), in order to bear our punishment. Without the removal of guilt, and the establishment of the liberty of righteousness, God could not have offered us freedom anew. For this reason His saving love gave His own Son into death upon the Cross.

There is a modern sentimentality which denies this sacrifice for sin by Christ, because it has lost the sense of sin, and has degraded God's love into a weak disregard of right and wrong.

But we must ask further, what it was in the sacrifice for sin, which Christ took upon Himself, that gave it its redeeming and liberating power. Was it the mere shedding of blood as such? Did it consist in the giving up of a life only as a life? The redeeming value of Christ's sacrifice was in the spirit in which He gave up His life. It consisted in the attitude of the obedience of righteousness. Obedience rectified and removed the disobedience of man. "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" (Romans 5:18, 19). All sin has flowed out of disobedience.[4] It was the essence of transgressing God's law, the source of desire, and the starting-point of selfishness. This perverted attitude of man Christ overcame by His spirit of filial obedience toward the Father. A new relation of man to God was established through Jesus who represented us before God.

It has been objected again and again, that the

---

[4] Cf. chap. VI.

idea of substitution in the sacrifice of Christ is not moral. No one, it is argued, can stand in the place of another. Each one must answer to God for himself. But the conception of individual responsibility, true to a certain extent, forgets the solidarity of men. We are in the unity of the race from Adam. There is heredity of flesh, and an inheritance of common guilt and sin, always reenforced by every generation of mankind. The eternal Son became flesh to enter into the solidarity of mankind. He was *the Son of Man.* In His universality He summed up the human race in Himself, but He did so in the sinless perfection of His character and life. Consequently He became our representative, not by vote or election, but by an inner, living connection with mankind. We can become the inheritors of the second Adam, the beginner of a new race of the redeemed. The sacrifice of Jesus is, therefore, not a usual substitution of any one human being for another. He, the absolutely normal, the spotlessly perfect man, can suffer rightly and die, not only on our behalf, but truly for us as He makes Himself one with us, in order to make us one with Him in the freedom of the glorious life of the sons of God.

The seal and guarantee of Christ's sacrifice is given in His resurrection. Without it we would not know that He had freed us. The resurrection not merely proves the power of Christ over His

own life, and His deity, but also the acceptance by the Father of the sacrifice of Christ. Through the resurrection Jesus passes by way of the ascension to His heavenly and eternal, regal throne.

CHAPTER IX

The Results of Restoration

The liberty without man had to become the liberty within man. The freedom which Christ wrought for mankind had to be wrought within mankind. The sufferings and the sacrificial death of Jesus, with all that they implied and carried with them, established liberty as a status for man. The old relation of man to God through the slavery of sin was made the new relation of man toward God by the perfect spirit of obedience which Christ possessed and showed. The former attitude of God to man, which was the reaction of holy love, became the new attitude of saving and liberating reconciliation. An atonement (at-one-ment) had been accomplished that offered the blessed unity of vital liberty between God and man. But in what respects did the freedom show itself? What were the real results of the restoration of the long lost liberty?

The first consequence was the right relation to law. By law is meant the eternal right and the everlasting justice, which have their foundation, not in the changeable and imperfect legislation of man, but in the perfect, unalterable, holy and loving will of God. The vital commandments of God, succinctly revealed in the ten words pro-

claimed through Moses, had been externalized. Man had looked upon them as upon a burdening letter. Human conduct of the law, and human penalties for its transgression, must take cognizance of the clearly proved act of the wrong. The motive and intention must be inferred from the act, or confessed by the doer of evil, and the perpetrator of the crime. But in the divine law the whole question is primarily the thought back of any deed. God judgeth according to the heart. The deed may never have been committed from fear, or some other inhibiting motive, which did not essentially disavow the intention of the sinful deed. Christ pressed home to men this inner meaning of the law in the Sermon on the Mount. Looked at from its spirit the law ceased to be a letter. Two results followed when the law was apprehended from within. First, men could not evade its condemnation by claiming to have kept the letter. As soon as the spirit of the law, which is love to God and man, was known, man must have felt his inability to keep it. From this disability Christ brought deliverance. Second, the letter of the law, with its enactments and prohibitions, was a burden. The inner desire of man in his sinful freedom resented any hindrance of the law. Christ lifted this burden when He redeemed from sin.

The divine law was not permitted to remain in its great and strong simplicity. Where freedom for man was sought through legalism, command-

ments and injunctions were added. It was a very erroneous and foolish idea that the inclination to keep the law would become stronger if the law were made severer. Thus many traditional additions to the law arose. Christ freed man from all these accretions. He scraped away all the barnacles which had fastened themselves upon the law. More laws, and more stringent laws, only increased the desire in men to break laws. The honest strivers, who sought to obey the law, were the more heavily laden down by demands upon demands. It was natural, therefore, that exceptions were taken and that evasions were developed. Such easements of the stringency of man-made laws were a deception, and out of them hypocrisy grew. The lesser and adventitious traditions were kept, and the weightier matters of the law, the real right, were passed by. It is hypocrisy which Jesus so severely castigated in the Jewish leaders. As He describes them, they claim to be observers of the law, but they are full of pride; they make long prayers, but devour widows' houses; they make proselytes only to make them the more children of hell. They swear by lesser things and do not call it a real oath; they tithe mint, anise and cummin, but have no mercy and faith; they make laws of external cleanliness, and within they are sepulchres whited outside; they claim to be heralds of truth, and yet they kill their noble prophets (Matt. 23). Such is the result of their hypocrisy! Christ

brought deliverance from this whole misuse of the law through the deep truthfulness of His testimony. He died for the truth. He is the Truth, and therefore He can destroy the delusions and the untruth of misapplied law. His obedience broke the chains.

There is a third attitude toward the law. There are earnest spirits who really try to keep it not only in letter, but in spirit. But the more they try, the less they succeed. Their failure deepens in them the sense of sin. A superficial soul does not appreciate this sin-convincing power of the law. But the deeper, sincere seekers after real righteousness experience their total disability. No one has felt this more deeply and expressed it more clearly and directly than Paul. Realizing the failure of the law to make him righteous, he asks: "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died" (Romans 7:7-9). There has been no better psychological analysis of the effect of the law upon earnest strivers who seek to do right. Man needed the revelation of the law to show him how sinful he was. It acted as a mirror for his soul. But as long as the law was disregarded, man

lived without feeling its condemnation. And when the law came, the sinful desire for wrong freedom reacted against it. Even in his enslaved condition man, failing to realize real liberty, seeks it. It is a memory he cannot lose and a desire he cannot quench. But when the longing is shot through with the lust of sin, man cannot find what he wants. Then the divine commandment irritates him, and leads him to new transgression. Even when the law is recognized as spiritual the struggle continues.

As long as man is still under the bondage of sin he is carnal in mind and purpose. Then he confesses with Paul, if he be honest: "For that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that I do not, but what I hate that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me" (Romans 7:15-17). Into this state of wanting to be free, and yet not being able through the power of sin, Christ comes to liberate. The law becomes "our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ" (Gal. 3:24). Out of the consciousness of sin and of our impossibility to fulfill the law, arises the desire for another way. The experience of honest, religious men has always contained this desire. Christ came to answer this deep wish and longing for freedom and escape from the law. It is in this sense that He is the end of the law. The law is fulfilled by Him. Therefore it no longer

rests upon us. The old conflict in the religious life between law and liberty ceases. We are no longer under the law. How we fulfil it in a new way will appear as we consider the growth of liberty.

The liberation which Christ has effected in freeing men from the oppressive yoke of the law, is not to be an advocacy of complete absence of the law in the Christian world. There are many who have no right to be free for they are not freed within. Christianity never rejected the law as a necessity for evil-doers. The divine law should form the just foundation for right human law, not in its letter but in its spirit. Law and government are still necessary (Romans 13:1 ff). If there were a completely christianized civilization the need for law would cease, because all men would do the right from an inner urge of righteousness. But the Kingdom has not yet come in this measure. Therefore the law must remain a restraint against evil and an upholder of the moral and spiritual order.

The law, from which we were freed, had served to awaken in us the feeling and sense of guilt. The consciousness of guilt lies heavily upon the consciences of men, causes great unrest, and brings home the terrible enchainment of sin. There are many men who do not experience the feeling of guilt either toward God or man. Their consciences have been put to sleep, or deadened to any realization of the guilt of sin and of trans-

gression. A superficial generation in our day does not analyze the deepest cause of its unrest and its dissatisfaction with life. There is no appreciation of the word of Augustine: "Our soul is restless until it rests in Thee, O God." Modernist religion has aided in suppressing the sense of guilt by explaining all wrong, after the manner of materialistic science, simply as weakness, abnormality, inherited disability, and pressure of environment. Social and economic conditions are blamed for evil, and the remedy is sought in the change of conditions and circumstances. But the genuine seekers after righteousness, who hunger and thirst after it (Matt. 5:6), cannot escape from the knowledge and feeling of their unworthiness to stand before God through their own merits. This unworthiness, they explain, as no mere finiteness before the Infinite, no simple weakness in the presence of almightiness, no human ignorance in the light of divine omniscience, but as the witness to the guilt from which man cannot free himself.

The liberation of Christ in His sacrifice consits primarily in the forgiveness of sins (Romans 3:25). Forgiveness is no overlooking of sin, but a removal of its guilt because of Christ's redemption. It is compatible with God's righteousness through the reconciliation of Christ. Through it man realizes the depth of his sin, and the lifting of the burden of guilt. Never can divine forgiveness be conceived properly if it is made the

outcome of God's love that overlooks sin. Forgiveness is only possible because God's holiness has been satisfied. To forgive without curing the one forgiven of future sins only deepens the guilt of sin. The easy manner in which much modern theology deals with forgiveness is partly responsible for the increase of wrong and sin. By depreciating what it cost Christ to liberate us, and by minimizing the guilt of transgressions and trespasses before God, forgiveness is made an idle ceremony. No change of heart is wrought until there is a deep-seated conviction of the guilt that has been done away with in the forgiveness resting upon Christ's propitiation. The inestimable gift of forgiveness must be emphasized again; and the superficial conception of it, developed from early youth through the indulgent complacency and the soft-hearted and misapplied affection of parents, must be overcome.

Before man is freed from guilt, and declared just, he is under the wrath of God (Eph. 2:2). Professor Elert of Erlangen calls the God of mere nature, and the God of the non-Christian, the angry God. In this idea he is stressing the truth of the wrath of God. God does not bear any ill-will or wrath against any one, as a human being, even including the sinner. But in His holy love He does reject the sin which enthralls men. This is God's anger against Satan. If He were indifferent and complacent He would not love us. Because God loves us He hates the sin that en-

slaves and destroys us. The heavenly Father would not be true to Himself, and He would not be the free God, who desires our liberty, if He condoned evil, and did not oppose it with all possible zeal. But Christ has taken away this wrath resting upon the sinner. It only remains for sinful man to accept the gift of Christ.

After the condemnation of the law is lifted, the guilt of sin removed, and the divine wrath against sin appeased, man is free in relation to God. This liberty finds its foundation in the bestowal of righteousness upon man because of Christ's atonement. Man is declared just in the sight of God. Justification of the sinful man is the objective basis for the whole development of liberty in redeemed man. It is necessary in order that men might be able to rest upon a firm assurance in the unfoldment of their spiritual life. The gift of freedom, which man had at the beginning of the race, has been given to him again. It does not destroy man's own responsibility, and cause him to rely upon God's grace to the detriment of his own spiritual welfare. He is not weakened, but supported in his striving after the liberty of goodness through the new and bestowed righteousness. Those who accuse Paul in having condoned sin, and taken away the moral fibre through the teaching of justification,[1] do not un-

[1] Of this H. W. Carr says: "In it we have the triumphant affirmation of human freedom, the self-assertion of the Spirit."—"The Unique Status of Man," p. 21.

derstand either the teaching nor the experience of Paul.

The righteousness of God, which is freely given, is necessitated through the inability of man to establish his own goodness which can avail in the sight of God. Man cannot earn any merit through his usual life. There is often a misunderstanding as to the difference between the righteousness before God, the complete justification, and the civic righteousness. The respectability which a man may have, and the possession of a good name and reputation which he may possess in the world, is no proof of his being right with God. Even the character which does not fall under any judgment of human law, nor is condemned in the average estimation of men, often has deep blemishes. When the best of us begin to analyze our motives some of our apparently best deeds lose their moral and spiritual value. It needs a greater righteousness than that of the scribes and Pharisees to be just (Matt. 5:20).

It is very hard for mankind to appreciate the righteousness given by grace through Christ, because it is so natural for all men to try and work out their own salvation. The need for justification was soon forgotten, and men relapsed into a new legalism. To this day there are Christians who suppose that they are justified, not simply and solely by God's goodness, but through some contribution of their own deeds. They attempt to make the liberty of the Christian a co-operative

result of God and man. In such an attitude the fact is overlooked that men can only maintain and develop their spiritual freedom after its basis has been given in God's declaration, that they are free through Christ. The idea has been proposed that men are justified in view of their further progress in liberty. God is supposed to foresee what a man will do, and in view of the life which a man will unfold through his efforts to grant him justification in advance. But this idea neglects to take into account the fact, that the future development of man's freedom would be impossible without the full declaration of righteousness upon which he can build with assurance and confidence.

The common term for the new righteousness, "justification by faith," has also been subject to misunderstanding. The attitude of faith and trust has been conceived of as causal and creative of justice. Any sort of faith is taken to possess liberating power. But the faith which justifies is simply the receptive attitude which a soul takes toward the offered gift of righteousness through Christ. Faith is not constitutive, but only conditional to the reception of liberty in Christ. It is the accompaniment of a change of mind. When the divine reality is presented to man, as it is found in the objective work of restoration by Christ, it aims to call forth a complete change of a man's usual attitude. This inner change of mind and heart is the acknowledgment on the

part of man that he needs forgiveness. It is the precursor of faith. Faith is the obverse of the change of mind. The two must go together if a man is to be capable of receiving and accepting the gift of liberty through justification.

The new righteousness is dependent upon divine grace. It is very important to understand grace aright. It is the loving condescension of God by which He seeks and saves us through Christ. Because He first loved and sought us we have no desert or merit. But this truth, that opens to us the pathway to spiritual liberty, must be carefully defined. All too often grace has been made arbitrary, and, then, with the addition of God's eternal will for men, it has been made selective. Some men were chosen, others were passed by. Such choice, or neglect of selection, was in no wise supposed to be dependent upon man's attitude. There resulted an emphasis upon God's sovereignty and arbitrary will, which cast the shadow of injustice upon God. When the advancing moral feeling of men reacted against such an enslaving and willful idea of grace, it went to the other extreme of conceiving of divine love so sentimentally, and so without holiness, that liberty was again endangered. It was endangered because divine love was interpreted in a manner that wiped away the distinction of good and bad. The will to save all men was thought of as a will that demanded no removal of sin through sacrifice. God was simply forgetting sin,

and not offering liberation through the suffering and death of Christ.

The result of the restoration of liberty also includes the liberation of man from the power of Satan. Man was first led into sin through the Tempter. In the whole bondage under sin man was likewise the slave and servant of evil. This control of evil in and through the Devil was broken by Christ. He said in view of His sacrifice: "The prince of this world is judged" (John 16:11). When a soul accepts Christ the domination of Satan ceases. It is true that temptations do not come to an end. The Christian freed by Christ is not protected against the assaults of the evil one. He still goeth about to tempt and seduce, to assault and destroy the Christian (I Peter 5:8). The temptations are manifold, and it easily happens in the new freedom, that men may be found "using liberty for a cloke of maliciousness" (I Peter 2:16). But evil does not have a hold upon a believer as it does upon an unbeliever. The temptation does not overcome the faith. And even if there is a temporary success of Satan it does not last in the case of a Christian. When the redeemed are overcome by a fault they are restored by faith. Satan has no permanent control of those living in the liberty of Christ. No one has sung so triumphantly of the discomfiture of Satan as Martin Luther. He says:

"Though devils all the world should fill,
All watching to devour us,
We tremble not, we fear no ill.
They cannot o'erpower us.
The prince of this world may still
Scowl fierce as he will,
He can harm us none,
He's judged; the deed is done;
One little word o'erthrows him."

The conquest of Satan carries with it the freedom from the fear of death. Sin which had death as its wages gave the Devil power over death. But Christ through death destroyed this dominion (Hebrews 2:14). Death gained a sad meaning through the first sin of man, but through redemption it obtained another meaning. The spiritual decay and degeneration of mankind was halted as far as it lived in Christ. The physical death still remained, but with its mystery it was no longer a terror. Its dread and fear were overcome. There has been a modern movement which has endeavored to deny the reality of human sickness and the actuality of death. But this idealism contradicts the facts of experience. The mortal thoughts of illness have not been banished even for the idealistic deniers of sickness. Death may euphemistically be called "passing," but it is still the decay of the physical body and the total cessation of life on earth. Christianity has nothing in common with this delusion which rests on an

overstatement of the power of the mind over body, and is an exaggerated philosophical idealism parading as religion. The liberty of the Christian in sickness and death is no delusion. It soberly accepts the present ills of life as a school in patience and forbearance; and it bears the hour of death with the assurance of a great hope. Death for the redeemed Christian is no condemnation, but a joyous release. It does not possess the sting of sin any longer. As a natural event death remains for the present, but its import is not destruction but deliverance.

PART IV

THE GROWTH OF LIBERTY

CHAPTER X

In the Individual

All that is real for man and in man is a matter of life. But there can be no life, and no continuance of life, without the birth that leads to development and growth. The gift of liberty through Christ must become ours in a growing life. The freedom from the condemnation of the law, the forgiveness of sins, the new righteousness, the loosing of the bonds of Satan, and the escape from the fear and dread of death,—all these must enter into the unfoldment of our spiritual life. For this reason Jesus testifies to the necessity of the new birth. The liberty of Christ must become our freedom through the birth of the Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ (John 3:6).

It has often been assumed that this newness of spiritual life i only possible in the years of self-determination and discretion. But among most Christians there exists the more or less consistent belief that the growth in the spirit should be parallel with the growth of the physical life. There is, however, a lack of the realization in many parts of Christendom what power and effect baptism has in the life of the infant. The hypothesis of the innocent infant, or the idea of

Wordsworth, when he says: "Trailing clouds of glory have we come from heaven, which is our home," is not in agreement with the fact of heredity. Jesus knew better, for He claims: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh" (John 3:6). Shall this condition be allowed to go on into the riper years? Or shall the infant be "born of water and the Spirit" (John 3:5)?

The very little children have a right to the Kingdom according to Christ. Against the hindrance of misunderstanding disciples Jesus affirmed: "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. 19:14). Child life with its simplicity is no bar, and even we who are older must become as little children to enter the Kingdom (Matt. 18:3). The little child cannot be forbidden "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Titus 3:5). It must be allowed to "put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27), whom it does not possess by its natural birth. Only through water and Spirit can any one enter the Kingdom (John 3:5). If the benefits of Christ's redemption are not to be denied to the child, it must "be baptized into His death" (Romans 6:3). He desires to "cleanse it with the washing of water by the word" (Eph. 5:26). There is no doubt that the principles of the right of the child to the Kingdom, and of baptism as the only gateway of entrance, are clearly indicated in the New Testament. It is true that at the beginning of

Christianity the adults were baptized first. The children were only admitted after the Christianization of the parents, and this procedure was perfectly natural and explicable.

The objection, which is in constant opposition to the baptism of the young children, amounts to the denial of the possibility of the child's understanding what baptism is and means. And this argument is urged by the very group which emphasizes that faith is confidence, and not intellectual apprehension. In contradiction with such a conception of faith the intellectual side of belief is stressed to oppose and reject the possibility of child faith. In our day the infant is estimated as a mere undeveloped human animal. The purely biological conception rules, and it is an outcome of materialistic evolution. But if mind cannot be submerged into a bodily process, or be made a part of organic functioning, then we must allow the child to have a mind from its birth. Otherwise mind would only be a later organic epiphenomenon of the bodily life. The child is, consequently, best conceived of, if it is thought to be a human being with an incipient mind and a real soul at its birth. To-day it has been established that there can be an influence upon mind and will through subconsciousness. Experiments have shown that persons can be put into a hypnotic state, and that they can be influenced without conscious awareness. Mind can and has acted upon mind without direct com-

munication of speech, and without an appeal to understanding and conscious knowledge. Motions and passive affections have been brought about from a distance, and they were not known until they surged up from the subconsciousness. Telekinetic and telepathic influences do exist. In the light of these facts, who can deny *a priori,* that the Spirit of God cannot in some similar, though still at present unknown and mysterious manner, act upon the half-slumbering mind and the undeveloped will of the child. This assumption is not as impossible and as improbable as rationalism dares to affirm.

But the growth of the life of the child after baptism cannot be left to accident. The spiritual life does not unfold without cultivation. The gift of the life of liberty to the child must be nurtured by the Christian care of the parents. This today is utterly neglected in most homes. Then the school and Church are asked to supply the want. But the secular school cannot be charged with the task of developing spiritual life. Its only duty is to help in the growth of mind and in the development of character for good citizenship. But it cannot offer the ultimate motives of goodness because it does not teach the religious aspect of life. Consequently, the whole burden falls upon the Church. And the Church is only now awakening to the inefficient manner in which it has endeavored to help the spiritual growth of the child. Even where the duty of developing

the child in the spirit of Christian liberty is accepted seriously, the plan and method is not directed definitely enough toward making the child a free Christian child. It is well enough to teach the Bible stories, the great hymns of the Church, and its glorious rites, but such education for effective church membership is not directly the kind of training needed to develop a free character. There must be more attention given to the problem, how we can make the child safely self-determining. In secular education this effort is being made. But the liberty into which a growing child is led without the inner freedom of the soul is deceptive. A child is not by nature really free, and if it is too much encouraged in the mere external liberty of decision and action, it is very liable to disregard the necessity of obedience. We have so much perversion of true liberty just because we have not led growing youth into the paths of the liberty of the real and final good.

When childhood passes into youth, and youth into the riper years of experience, the growth ought not to stop. No greater mistake is being committed constantly, than to assume that, after the nursery days are over, we can allow the boy and girl to grow like Topsy. And yet the general practise is very thoughtless. When the days of conflict begin, in which childish notions and ways must be put aside, there is no vital guidance. The liberty of the child of God is lost in many instances. A learning which is without any in-

fluence of God and Christ promises intellectual emancipation. All faith is cast aside in the embarkation upon the wild waves of a liberty of license. The old standards are denied and mocked by outstanding intellectuals. Spiritual life is portrayed as an illusion, or an imprisonment in mossback traditions.

No greater task confronts the present day and age than the guidance of youth into the larger liberty of Christ, not through prohibition of knowledge, and identification of Christianity with ignorance, but by means of a sound instruction which will show the real and lasting value of Christian freedom. But this instruction must not be imposed from without, but rather used to develop the life of Christian liberty from within. The growth ought to be continuous throughout life. Nothing is more conducive to lasting joy and permanent happiness, in the cumulative experiences of life, and in the complexities of work, than the unending attention to the life of real liberty. We are liable, as responsibilities increase, and the burdens of riper years come, to fret under them. Thus we lose the glorious freedom of the children of God.

It may seem that the whole view of Christian development as life, takes it out of the sphere of conscious influence. If we develop good habits more and more, habits that make for freedom, shall we not then become unconsciously good? Will we not be like a good tree that brings forth

good fruit of itself (Matt. 7:17)? The persistence in decisions for liberty will form virtue. And virtue is economy of action, as it crystalizes into habit. But still we must constantly attend to our spiritual life even where the good habits of freedom are formed. Spiritual life does not grow without continued care and attention. Bodily life becomes more and more relegated into the unconscious, or subconscious, existence in man. There is a constant decussation from the higher brain-centers to the lower centers in the medulla oblongata. But spiritual life, the development of liberty, cannot be relegated into the subconscious even though it has become habit.

The reason why the growth of liberty can never fall below the level of consciousness is the fact, that we must constantly war against the influences that would rob us of our freedom. There must be a conscious turning toward liberty and a turning away from sin and evil which do beset us. The new life demands a reaction on our part, not only as we permit it to grow, but also as we fight against the evil. In an ideal sense, and as far as we have the life of Christ in us (Gal. 2:20), we do not sin (I John 3:6). "Whosoever is born of God does not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God" (I John 3:9). To the degree that the life of God is lived, without let or hindrance, we are growing normally from goodness to goodness. We are passing from liberty to ever larger

liberty. But at the same time we still fail and sin. And the same John, who describes the ideal development, is compelled to say: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (I John 1:8). Although the guilt of sin has been removed, and God has forgiven us through Christ, the temptations do not cease, and through weakness we still commit the evil, and omit the good. It is impossible for us to lull ourselves into a sleep of assured safety.

There are two ways in which the reaction of turning from evil takes places. Some men long under the thraldom of sin go their way apparently without compunction of conscience. Their thoughts do not accuse them; or if some self-judgment takes place occasionally, it always ends with an exoneration. But it happens that under the spell of some great message, or impelled by a mighty emotional wave brought about through the contact of a common psychological mood, the mind and heart of the soul, long careless in sin, and unconcerned about salvation, is stirred to the depths. The very foundations of the emotional life are ploughed up. Old habits are put into the fire of self-accusation, and the long suppressed conscience rises up. Its lightnings and thunders cannot be overheard. It may be perhaps that some men are led to conversion in a quieter way; but they also have had no real spiritual life before.

The other way is the constant and slow turning

away from sin. Where there has been some Christian life from youth up no storm passes over the soul. No violent awakening is needed. There may be times when a stronger reaction than usual takes place. But still such a rejection of sin and transgression is more like the katabolism of the body. It is a sort of normal casting out of the diseased and obstructive, or the outlived and wasted tissue of the spiritual life. There follows then a strong and decided anabolism. However this is no unconscious or subconscious process. A living and active conscience brings about the elimination of the evil. Where this continued transition from wrong in thought and act occurs the conscience is alert, and the will for the good is active. Liberty is being created by man, as in response to God's working in man both to will and to do the good, man continues to work out his "own salvation with fear and trembling" (Phil. 2:12, 13).

In the continuity of the good, free life the Christian uses the wonderful means of grace which is given him in the Lord's Supper. He not only reverts to his baptism in daily sorrow and repentance, and in daily assurance of forgiveness, as the ever-renewed aid of God in making effective the beginning of Christian life in baptism. But, in addition, he knows what he possesses in the holy communion. It is a definite call beyond the daily repentance for the testing of the spiritual life. Paul's injunction is recalled:

"But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself not discerning the Lord's body" (I Cor. 11:28, 29). The reality of the Lord's body broken and given with His blood for the remission of sins (Matt. 26:26-28), makes a Christian very earnest in his look in upon his soul. He knows that the communion is a real fellowship with the sacrifice of Christ through His body and blood. He accepts the joyous confession of Paul: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ" (I Cor. 10:16)? In this blessed supper of Christ he looks back upon the atoning death of Christ, and he knows: "For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come" (I Cor. 11:26). But what is done in remembrance is also celebrated in hope, for some day the Christ with His own will drink the fruit of the vine anew in the Father's Kingdom (Matt. 26:29). The communion is no mere rite and no idle ceremony, but the reception of the confirming power of forgiveness, and the bestowal of a renewal of the life of liberty. The same God who nourishes mankind through earthly bread, in which His power dwells, increases life by overcoming evil and sin through the heavenly bread and the heavenly wine of the holy communion. It

belongs as an essential element to the growth in holiness of the life of the Christian.

The new and developing life, which, casting out the sin, unfolds a living goodness and a joyous freedom, is a life within the holy, just and good law of liberating love. When we live freely in this law we have looked into "the perfect law of liberty" (James 1:25). It is impossible for the redeemed and growing Christian to be under the law. The dominance of the law from without has come to an end in redemption. But the heart is within the law, and the law is within the heart. There is no necessity to command: "Thou shalt love," because the believer confesses: "I do love." He does not love God and his fellowmen in order to fulfill a commandment, but he loves from an inner desire, and from a spiritual urge. Where these are absent man is still subject to the law with its "Thou shalt." The free Christian does the right and lives in the good because this is his choice, and he wants to think and act in terms of true love.

All life is now guided by the inner law of love, which is the law of perfect liberty. As far as the realization of this free life is concerned, it shows itself not only in expression, but also in self-imposed repression. Paul illustrates this self-control of love, which is no slavery, in dealing with the Corinthian Christians. There were some members of this early congregation who did not

sever all relation with their pagan neighbors. At times they went to their dinners. At these meals the meat that was eaten was a part of a sacrifice offered to the gods. Now some of the brethren were offended, and thought that the participation in dinners where such meat was served was a denial of the one God and of Christ. But those who accepted the invitations of their heathen neighbors did not consider that they were doing anything wrong. Their conscience did not reprove them, and they did not believe that they had endorsed any pagan belief in gods.

Paul, on the one hand, attempts to solve this difficulty, by stating: "We know that an idol is nothing in the world" (I Cor. 8:4); but, on the other hand, he says: "But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils" (I Cor. 10:20). The apparent contradiction resolves itself, if we take Paul to mean that the image, the idol, is no reality over against God, but that there is an evil power in the pagan sacrifices. Still he does not absolutely forbid the Corinthian Christians to go to Gentile meals. But he does ask those who are in the habit of going to such dinners to forbear, even if they feel free in their conscience, lest by any means their liberty become a stumblingblock to the weak (I Cor. 8:9). The very same advice is offered to the Roman Christians. The kindly counsel is given: "It is good

neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak'' (Romans 14: 21).

The application of this principle of self-restraining love in our day is evident. We are confronted with a prohibitory law against which many rebel. The Christian may not believe that an alcoholic drink is in itself sinful. He may be able to take liquor without damage to himself. The danger of over-indulgence or of drunkenness may not be his. But when he realizes what use of alcoholic liquor has done, and why it is so bad under present economic conditions, and in the quick, nervous life of to-day, he will never drink. And yet restraining himself in love he will be free. He does not obey the law of the land under compulsion but out of love. Where this motive does not rule there will inevitably be open or secret rebellion against a limiting law. The same attitude will be taken by a believer in reference to any law that is not in itself evil and unrighteous. Here lies the secret of Christian freedom which is so little understood to-day. Those who defend the law make puritanic demands, and ask that the law be obeyed simply because it is a law. They do not justify it to men through its beneficient intent. On the other hand the opponents of the law descend to the desires of the flesh, and surrender the law because of an insubordinate minority. They plead for a merely natural liberty, for the gratification of the appetite.

There will be no help until Christians begin to proclaim and practise the law of liberty in the restraint of love.

The growing life of liberty is one of continuous culture of the soul. It keeps before itself the best ideals and it makes this appeal: "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things" (Phil. 4:8). With such purposes before the mind there is a development of all that is good and liberating. The culture of the soul ought to be many-sided. Too often there is an unfoldment of one or two virtues. The Christian life should have a balanced growth. In his autobiography Benjamin Franklin, the Deist, tells how he made out a table of virtues, and how every day he kept account of his conduct. He marked what he considered his successes and his failures. But in all his efforts he only developed some virtues in part to the degree that an unregenerate man can do so. Some of his greatest vices he did not overcome.[1] Even if we are impelled by the love and liberty of the new life we cannot thus sever our life. But, nevertheless, we ought to survey our aims, ideals, and purposes, our words and acts, not only in a general

[1] Fäy, "Benjamin Franklin."

way, but individually and closely. Culture demands an all-around development, and it calls for the concentrated effort of earnest cultivation of all virtues in the spirit of freedom.

The Christian is not afraid of any truth anywhere. Because he is in Christ, the Truth, he knows that all things are his (I Cor. 3:21). No narrow puritanism hampers his life. Although he does turn away from what is impure and degrading in literature, music and art, he values all the more every noble gift, and every fine expression of truth. He is no enemy of true science, and he is willing to accept all real advance in human endeavor of every sort. Through his Christian culture the believer has a fine standard of all that in any department of human life is ennobling and uplifting. He moves as a free man in the great world of nature, of art, and of religion. His freedom is not skeptical and destructive, but believing and constructive.

CHAPTER XI

The Fellowship of Freedom

It has almost become a commonplace to assert that man is not only an individual, but also a member of society. And still it must be stressed again in view of the assertive individualism of to-day. No one of us is a mere independent unit. We cannot live only in and for ourselves. None of us is born as an orphan. Everyone from birth onward is a member of some family. Through the family all of us are in a circle of relatives. We grow up in a certain locality, and belong to a definite state, and to a special country. Through our parentage we are also inducted into the life of some church, if our parents have a real church affiliation. Later in life, through school, through business, and through social and fraternal associations, we are tied up with men. It is impossible to escape life in the social complex unless we become anchorites, or try to live in a desert utterly alone. Social connections are not mere additions of individual wills, but they have an existence and life of their own. There are and always will be two sides to our life, the individual and the social.

As soon as we realize that we are bound up in a social complex of various kinds we are compelled to give liberty a social meaning and inter-

pretation. At the present too many still think of freedom in the term of individualism. Their conception is an inheritance from the eighteenth century. Men who claim to be progressive in many ways contradict their claim of being advanced when they come to define liberty. It means for them simply the untrammeled right of the individual. The desire and the choice, the want and the need, of the separate man or woman are made the test of freedom. But there can be no individual liberty without social liberty.[1] If every one wants and seeks only his own freedom, he must either go out of society, or come into conflict with the liberty of other persons. Your freedom and my freedom cannot each have the right of way unless there is a social adjustment. It is for this fundamental reason that the law of liberty is the law of love. Only as we freely love our neighbors as ourselves can there be general freedom, without opposition and conflict. Universal liberty demands peace and cannot endure war. This demand is especially true in religion. Spiritual freedom must be more than individual liberation through Christ.

In Christianity the social character of all re-

[1] "Freedom, of course, is not merely the state of individuality untrammeled by social restraints and obligations. There is a freedom as well in social relations, even where regulated; and truly it is social freedom that is most estimable." H. E. Bliss, "The Organization of Knowledge and the System of the Sciences," p. 10. Everett Dean Martin's "Liberty" is essentially anti-Christian in contrast with Dr. Campbell's "Liberty and Restraint," which is Christian.

ligions finds its freest expression. Early tribal religion, and later national religion, demanded adherence to the faith. But original Christianity, the ideal Christianity, only has a free brotherhood of faith. The Christian Church is intended to be a fellowship of freedom in religion. The faith on which it is built is the acceptance of the Christ, the Son of the living God (Matt. 16:16 ff). All that Christ is in His own liberty, and all that He has effected in the restoration of vital freedom for man, has not only an individual value, but also a social worth. The freeing power of faith unites believers into a glorious brotherhood. All the varieties of personal gifts, all the special endowments of individuals, and all the peculiar capacities of men, are merged into one body. And this one body is no visible organization, but a spiritual organism with Christ as the directive head (I Cor. 12). In the common life of the body of Christ, the Church, men realize to the full all the benefits of the person and the work of Christ. The Church in this original spiritual reality is a unity of freedom in the one faith. The first Christians expressed this living unity of liberty in Christ through common prayers, the common feast of love, and the fellowship which rested on the apostles' doctrine as interpretative of the one faith (Acts 2:42). They were one body through the one Spirit. Their unity of faith in the one Lord, accepted in the one baptism, and leading to the one God and Father (Eph. 4:4 ff), fused

them into a fraternity of the great, freeing truth.

It was not only the common faith in Christ with its liberating truth, which made the Church so fine a brotherhood, but also the common love. At the beginning this love was so overflowing, that the Church at Jerusalem was led to a community of possessions. "Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made to every one according as he had need" (Acts 4:34, 35). But sin soon marred this experiment of love (Acts 5), and poverty followed, so that Paul collected in other churches for the want of the Jerusalem Christians. The one fact to be noted is the great spirit of love. The first believers were compared to living stones, resting in their faith upon prophets, apostles and ultimately Christ, but joined together as a holy temple of love (Eph. 2:20 ff). The figure of the body of Christ is also used to show the cementing power of love. From Christ "the whole body was fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love" (Eph. 4:16). Love, the law of social liberty, completed the unity of faith. Thus the prayer of Christ for the inner unity of His followers was heard. The faith confessed, and

the love expressed, put the seal upon the petition of Christ: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John 17:21). The inner unity of love in the Godhead was shown in the same unity of the love of Christians toward each other.

But the fellowship of freedom had its source in the creative power of the Spirit who operated through the word of God. The truth of Christ, and the Gospel which He proclaimed, was vivified and applied by the Holy Spirit (John 16:13). He brought Christ as truth and life into the hearts of men. The scattered disciples became a unity, and formed the first Church when the Spirit descended upon them at Pentecost. This coming of the Spirit was no passing mystical experience, but the beginning of a constant enlightenment in divine truth. The Church was not brought about by any resolution. Its character does not partake of a visible organization with a constitution and rules of procedure and order. The Spirit, who once moved upon the face of the waters in creation, moved over the hearts of the apostles, and created these hearts into the unity of the Church. The content which the Church had as its faith was nothing new. The Spirit simply unfolded Christ and glorified Him, as Christ had foretold: "He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you" (John 16:14).

The Church did not make its message but received it. Even the apostolic doctrine of Paul is not his own speculation, but the creative outcome of the Spirit glorifying Christ in and through the spiritual experience of Paul.

The early Church was a liberating force for Jew and Gentile. After the decision of the council of Jerusalem (Acts 15), differences of nationality, sex, and social status were inwardly overcome. Paul could say: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). A great unity of liberating peace was created, and the wall of partition which had separated men was cast down. All, whether Jews or non-Jews, entered into the true commonwealth of the spiritual and the new Israel (Eph. 2:11 ff). The gifts of baptism and the Lord's Supper were also unifying forces through the word of God. Paul speaks thus of baptism: "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit" (I Cor. 12:13). Baptism was not merely an individual grace, but it bound all who were baptized into the fraternity of freedom in Christ. The holy communion had the same effect. It was a uniting bond between believers, as well as a communion with Christ. Through the one bread, that conveyed the body of Christ, the Church was more and more made one

body. "For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread" (I Cor. 10:17). In such a manner the different strains of blood, and the varying men of different antecedents, were united into the glorious liberty of God's children in Christ Jesus.

The creative word must be distinguished from the New Testament as a book. The message of the Gospel made the fellowship of freedom, the Church, but the Church made the New Testament. At first the words and deeds, the life, and the sufferings and death of Jesus, were told and retold in a living tradition. Certain incidents clustered about other events, and definite cycles of the gospel story were formed. Then the disciples began to write short scraps and accounts of the gospel (Luke 1:1). By and by different rolls of single books arose. Among the gospels Mark seems to have been the first. Matthew was later, and he used a collection of the sayings of Christ. Luke drew upon these sources, and he also as a careful historian found further material. John wrote his gospel toward the end of the century. The letters of Paul and other epistles were sent to certain churches. Some of these epistles, like that sent to Ephesus, were circular letters. It is probable that the earliest writing was a letter of Paul, either I Thessalonians or Galatians. Gradually the different assemblies of Christians collected more and more of the New

Testament writings. Then step by step the canon of the New Testament arose. In it the leaders of the Church gathered the apostolic letters, and the gospels, which historical tradition sanctioned. It is remarkable that the books collected into the canon show a clear superiority in spiritual power and content over contemporaneous Christian compositions which were at first read in the churches. Through the New Testament as a canon the Church preserved the pure and original records of Christianity. Thus the message of Christian liberty, and the freeing work of Christ, were handed down to our times through the agency of the Church. The brotherhood of liberty gave to the world the Magna Carta of spiritual freedom.

The claims of the Church are resented strongly to-day by those who consider themselves to be the real defenders and proclaimers of man's vital liberty of spirit. The charge is preferred constantly that the Church demands a sacrifice of the unhampered intellect. It is portrayed as the hindrance to real, intellectual emancipation. The dogmas and creeds of the Church are described as shackles imposed upon human thought, and as bonds that prevent the free, forward movement of human progress in thought and endeavor. This is the common opinion of the intelligentsia, which is repeated *ad nauseam* by those who have a partial knowledge, and by those who parrot-like imitate the words, and ape the opinions, of the men who pose as the intellectual

gods of the age. Let us test these ideals in the light of facts.

How does intellect move? In what way are the attitudes of those who pose as spiritually liberated formed? There is in man an urge toward truth which cannot be escaped, even though the constant inclination is to think out problems only under the pressure of immediate necessity. The hunger for real truth persists. Then there arise leaders of thought, and great discoverers in the realm of reality, who see visions, or who by patient search give mankind new insight into the domain of truth and reality. Others accept these discoveries. Thus many live upon the genius of a Plato, a Newton, a Galileo, a Kant, a Darwin, a Homer, a Dante, a Shakespeare. Few individuals are originators, but most are adapters of the ideas of the great pathbreakers. Truth found by the pioneers gathers about it many men. Thus schools of thought are formed. From Socrates the way led through Plato to Aristotle. Locke opened the way for Berkeley and Hume. Kant, stimulated by Newton and Hume, made possible a Fichte and a Hegel. James broke ground for the pragmatic thought structures of Schiller and Dewey. In physics Maxwell influenced Farraday. Weissman followed Darwin in biology. There is no department of knowledge where common theories are not formed through the inter-relations of thought and the dependance of thinkers upon each other. Originality is a very relative matter.

In consequence, those revolters against accepting anything proposed by others, who attempt to identify freedom of spirit with pure individualistic constructions of thought, deceive themselves. Some there are who baldly reiterating the ideas of others either in hypocrisy or in ignorance, claim their opinions to be purely their own. In reality there are few masters, and many pupils and followers.[2]

The process, which is clearly shown in the adventure of reason to discover the facts and theories of nature and the universe, is parallel to the way in which the Church finds its creeds and its confessions. Just as there is an innate desire of right curiosity to discover the secrets of nature, so there exists in every normal soul the longing for religious satisfaction. There are questions of God, destiny, immortality, salvation, which will not down in the human race. All great world religions have struggled with them. A master revealer is needed. In philosophy, science and art there are many leaders.

But Christianity presents the one, supreme Master, Revealer, and Redeemer, who has not been surpassed by other masters. He has appealed to, and found honest human hearts, seeking religion. He has awakened belief. And out of belief have come expressions of the convictions held. "For with the heart man believeth unto

[2] For a brilliant discussion of originality and plagiarism, see Egon Friedell, "A Cultural History of the Modern Age," p. 44 ff.

righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation'' (Romans 10:10). This is the inevitable psychology of any truth discovered whether in the mind or through the heart. The Christians began in baptism to confess their faith. The simple confession was the germ of the Apostles' Creed, which gradually grew by adopting the statement of fact after fact of the New Testament revelation. As in other knowledge schools of a common creed were formed. Natural knowledge often found it necessary to rebut errors. It was in the same way that Christian creeds arose. The Nicene Creed was not a platform made by a few men. It was the defense of the Church against the error which sought to rob it of the deity of Christ.

While at times sin crept into the Church and force was resorted to, it must be remembered that in other spheres of truth there has also been dogmatism and persecution. To-day it happens that men are not persecuted bodily by the cynical intelligentsia, but they are derided and mocked. Their utterances are mostly suppressed. If they are given the temporary right of way, it is in a satirical manner after the method of the magazine *Mercury*. The persecuting advocates of an intolerant so-called ''tolerance'' have no claim of superiority in their inner spirit over the persecutors of any age. No one to-day is forced into a creed. Every one is free to examine the faith that is given him through his antecedents and from his parentage. There is as much intel-

ligence of the spirit in Christian truth as in any other truth. But it cannot be found by reducing the Gospel to a minimum, and depriving it of the inner unity and consistency which it possesses if it be accepted in its uncensored wholeness and completeness. The modern liberal is an inconsistent mystic. He is neither a pure believer, nor a pure rationalist.[3] With his attempt to carry water on both shoulders he spills the whole content which he tries to carry.[4]

Another accusation which to-day is leveled at the Church, is, that as an organization and an ecclesiastical machine, it tries to dominate men. The original democratic character has been lost through all sorts of government, whether it be episcopal, presbyterial, synodical, or even congregational. The liberty of Christ has been taken away by the human machinery of the Church. Men are not free in plan and action within the Church. Since much of the support of the Church comes from wealth, and from modern capitalism,

[3] "It is undeniable that rationalism is not the one and only prejudice, but only one of the many which humanity has to pass through in the course of history; but the assumption that it is a better prejudice than the rest, or the only sensible one, or, still more, that it is no prejudice at all, is a local obsession of modern Europe."—Egon Friedell, "A Cultural History of the Modern Age," Vol. I, p. 205. Shall we not say, that in America also this obsession in favor of rationalism rules in many places?

[4] Dr. H. B. Workman well says of eighteenth century rationalism: "The substitution of a moral for the supernatural basis of religion led to the decay of morality itself."—"The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge," p. 680.

the preacher dare not be a prophet of liberating righteousness. He must remember who supplies his bread and butter. Thus the Church is an enslaving power through its polity and government, and through its domination by great wealth, which seeks to have a guilty conscience eased through a comfortable gospel.

In response to this point of view it is well to remember certain other facts. The Church from the start had the leadership of bishops, overseers, or presbyters, elders. No social form can be so purely free and democratic as to be without any leadership. It is true, of course, that power in leadership tends everywhere, and not only in the Church, to abuse. But the early government of the Church fought against the vices of heathenism. It strengthened the inner liberty of soul in the days of trial and persecution. Men and women became liberated in heart and mind in the apostolic and post-apostolic Church. Their creed was the confession of their liberty. Later, when Church and State formed a union, the polity became more stringent and oppressive. But we must not forget, that down through the so-called Dark Ages, and into the Midle Ages, there was a great enlightening influence which went forth from the Church. "At all events, the Light that lightened the mediæval world came from the Church; the thinkers, the idealists, the reformers alike drew their inspiration from its teaching, and most of them were churchmen in the medi-

æval sense of the term, clerks of one description or another.'"[5] It was through the Church that learning was preserved in many a monastery. The invading barbarians were led into civilization. Thus a great service for the human spirit, and its liberation, was performed by the Church, which counterbalanced ecclesiastical domination.

When the Reformation came as a reaction to the trammels of ecclesiasticism, it asserted the principle of private judgment. Through this principle, even when it was forgotten in the Church, the way was opened for the modern right of free research in all departments of knowledge. In Protestantism there was no index of prohibited books or information. One of the beneficient results of the Reformation was the impetus given to popular education. Because every Christian was a priest he had the right of access to the record of revelation in his own language. Such an access was made possible through the invention of printing. The evangelical Christian was led to read the Bible for himself. To do this he had to learn to read. Illiteracy was compelled to give way to instruction. The whole modern increase of general literacy and the growth of common knowledge in many directions, owes its first start to the Church in its reformed character and life.

In the same manner the domination of one

[5] Dr. R. C. Rait in "The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge," p. 534.

state and one empire ceased when the Church favored nationalism, and encouraged the separate, smaller states. If the liberty gained is to be maintained the Church must continue to keep on in its divided condition. An unified and uniform Church is the end of liberty. No economic motive ought to move men to abandon the freedom of self-determining ecclesiastical bodies with their own confessions and their own polity, meeting the needs of different views, perpetuating valuable historic inheritances, and serving all sorts and conditions of men. No unity attained by the abandonment of vital truth can last. It has proved ephemeral in the past. The present rationalism has no lasting promise of the future, as can be shown by the deism and rationalism of the eighteenth century. The freedom of the spirit within, the liberating power of Christianity in the Church, and the deepest religious satisfactions, cannot be found in philosophy nor science, trimmed up in the feathers of a half-believing and a half-denying religion. The whole effort must be exerted to reëstablish under modern conditions the spirit and liberty of original Christianity.

There is a prejudice, promoted by the friends or bearers of the red flag, that the Church is a capitalistic institution. This charge is about as true as the old and oft-repeated excuse of non-churchmen, that all church people are hypocrites, either through intellectual dishonesty or by inconsistent life. The Church has not only its

Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, but also its Lazarus. The membership contains many poorer people, and also those of the middle class. Lately an investigation of social conditions by the Federal Council of Churches was branded with the title "socialism." The Church endeavors either to apply the fundamental moral principles of righteousness, justice, honesty and truth to all class questions, or it avoids any economic judgment, seeking only to awaken the conscience of men.

The prophets have not ceased who cry: "God is dead, and the Church is dying." One of the latest of such prognosticators is J. Middleton Murry, who not only claims: "The mission of a true Christianity was to destroy itself,"[6] but who also asserts: "It was possible, it was probable, that I should find few to understand that the mission of the Christian Church was to deny, with full knowledge, the uniqueness of its own revelation."[7] In answer to this and like pessimistic statements about the Church the fact remains, that the Church is still growing, and often increasing faster than the ratio of the growth of a people. It keeps on singing, despite all detractors, with full faith:

"Oh, where are kings and empires now,
Of old, that went and came?
But, Lord, Thy Church is praying yet,
A thousand years the same."

[6] "God," p. 64. [7] "God," p. 64.

CHAPTER XII

The Fulfillment of Freedom

The Christian always realizes that the growth of liberty is never complete in any earthly existence; he, therefore, looks with longing to the life to come. In it he hopes to find the fulfillment of freedom, and the perfect attainment of the imperfect development of the liberty of the children of God in time. For this reason the fact of death is for him important, because through the passage from earth to heaven the long cherished hope is to come to fruition. It is true that death in itself does not change a soul, but it does bring about the conditions of the heavenly life of the hereafter in which the unfoldment of spiritual liberty comes to a glorious stage.

For the natural man death at the best is an uncertainty, even if its dread be suppressed. It contains the doubt which Socrates, with all his self-control, is impelled to express about what he may expect after he has emptied the cup of hemlock. This attitude and mood of the non-Christian has been characterized thus: "Although death is a natural and inevitable event, it persists in being strange and unintelligible. It is life's end and not its consummation. It puts a stop to a man's existence without completing it, so that

we rarely think of death except when circumstances imply its nearness or when we deliberately reflect on the changes and chances of this mortal life. Prudence may counsel us that we should always be prepared to die and wisdom may advise us that death is not at all to be feared, but counsel and advice do not go well together. If being prepared to die means having things in readiness for the event, surely the event is in some respects to be feared. The consequences following upon it, either for ourselves or others, are, at least, uncertain.'"[1] This is as far as a non-Christian can go.

For the Christian death is a greater liberation from the ills of life than for the unbeliever (Rev. 21:4). Even now the believers "glory in tribulation also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed" (Romans 5:3 ff); they know that they are "saved by hope" (Romans 8:24). With the redemption of their body, and the deliverance from the bondage of corruption, they together with all creatures shall enter into the glorious liberty of the children of God.[2] It is a marvellous hope and assurance which sustain the Christian all through life, through tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril and sword.[3] In all struggles of

[1] F. J. E. Woodbridge, "The Son of Apollo," p. 209.
[2] Romans 8: 21, 23.
[3] Romans 8: 35.

life he breaks out into the triumphant certainty: "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 8:38, 39).

This mighty confidence upholds the dying believer, because he has within himself the sureness of the promise of eternal life. It does not begin after bodily death, but it starts in this present life. Even now "he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life" (John 3:36), for in the present life "this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (John 17:3). It lies within the power of Christ to give life. "The Son quickeneth whom he will" (John 5:21). He can say of those who follow Him with absolute certainty: "And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand" (John 10:28). Such a promise can be made by Christ because He can confidently assert: "I am the resurrection, and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die" (John 11:25). All of these assuring and comforting words of Christ received their endorsement in His own resurrection. Without it they are idle, and hold out no hope. The only difference be-

tween the Christian and the non-Christian at the time of death, and in the anticipation of it, is the privilege of resting upon Christ's resurrection as a historical and well-substantiated fact.

But in our day the central faith in a risen Christ is assailed. The best that is granted is, that the disciples believed that He had risen. But this must be an illusion if it is not founded on the fact of Christ's resurrection. An illusory resurrection of Christ makes all Christian hopes a self-deception. Among modern doubters none is more forcible than J. Middleton Murry. He puts Christ in the purely natural order, and conceives His life to have ended in failure as an outcast and criminal. He thinks the world is made stupid through the Christian faith. Because Christianity does not remove all evil at once he rejects it. It did not soothe his physical and mental pain. He says, in his unmanly whining: "The first thing for me to do in the world of Christian Orthodoxy would be to blow my brains out."[4] Perhaps some day this erratic, mystical radical will end thus in his hopeless faith of absorption into the unity of the universe, in the enchainment in the world as organism, even though he thinks that Christ made manifest "the origin of the metabiological coherence"[5] of the universe. Without any substantial proof Murry asserts of Christ: "That He rose again from

[4] "God," p. 79.
[5] This word means after-biological.

the dead means, in the fabric of Christianity, one thing and one thing only: that He rose again in the physical body. Men heard, saw, and touched Him. That, if it was true, was a unique event. Fortunately, there is no evidence for it as a unique event. For there is precisely the same kind of evidence for the bodily resurrection of all manner of uninteresting people. If we are required to take the evidence of the Gospels seriously on this matter, then we must take just as seriously the evidence for innumerable bodily resurrections. The event, if true, ceases to be unique.'"[6] This is a most unique dogmatism of unbelief, which confesses elsewhere, that the faith in Jesus as a supernatural being is revolting to it.

There are many men in the group of the modern radicals, who in consequence of the denial of the resurrection of Christ, have surrendered all belief in the continuance of the soul after death. They claim that they possess neither the desire, nor the proof for the immortality of the soul. This attitude is the outcome of two prevalent attitudes of to-day. First, it follows from the reduction of the mind to a part of the organic functioning of man. Its psychological basis is found in the usual behavioristic theories, although not all behaviorists have had the courage to draw the consequences of their psychological hypothesis. Because Dewey is of this type, and can-

[6] "God," p. 78.

not see beyond the world of immediate happenings, he constantly opposes all ideals and all supernaturalism. The second attitude which militates against the immortality of the soul, is a materialistic philosophy of life. It may be theoretical and mechanistic, or it may be practical. Many men want no hereafter, for they have suppressed the deepest human longings in their submergence in the satisfactions of the wealth, the prosperity and the pleasure of time. Others in this group fear death, because there is some lurking accusation in their conscience which they do not have the boldness to analyze, and to secure the assurance of peace through Christian faith. They want no hereafter in their cowardly procrastination of the issues of religion.

Attempts have been made to prove the existence of the soul after death. The spiritualistic set has endeavored again and again to demonstrate that communications with the dead are possible through special mediums. But in nearly every case mediums have been detected in fraud. And the communications have often been puerile. It seems strange that a thinker in science like Sir Oliver Lodge can be misled through the kind of messages which he claims to have received. In them, as well as in all similar communications from beyond, there is little that can be understood sanely. Often these messages are very trivial. The Society for Psychic Research has not yet obtained convincing evidence for the in-

tercourse of minds across the gulf of life and death. When Isaac Funk in his last feeble days thought that Henry Ward Beecher had told him where to find a certain coin, it was simply the surging up of a memory from the subconsciousness of Isaac Funk. It is possible for a mind with great longing to project some one who has been dear to the heart. Such an experience came to Russell Conwell, when he saw his wife sitting by his side upon the bed. Many similar cases can be found, and they can all be explained as illusions of the mind. But it may be that in the future when we have more thoroughly explored mind, starting from the present proven evidences of transference of thought, we may come a little closer to the problem of the possibility of spirit communication. At the present there is no convincing evidence. Faith is still the only bridge that spans the cleft between heaven and earth.

The hope of the future for the Christian is not simply the immortality of the soul. Christian truth demands the hope of the resurrection of the body. Immortality of the spirit is the pagan idea. In Greece it was first found among the Orphics, and it was upheld by the Pythagoreans. From these sources it came to Plato, who endeavored to prove the immortality of the soul. His arguments rested upon the assumptions that the soul was simple, that it was indestructible, that it remembered its heavenly past, and that as an idea it was synonomous with life. But none of these

arguments are finally convincing, and they did not bring to the world the firm assurance of the continuance of the soul. Modern historians, with all their critical acumen and the elimination of the possibility of any supernatural fact, are beginning to admit, since the argument of Harnack, that through Christianity, and its faith in Christ, the hope of an eternal destiny for man's spirit has been established. But the immortality of the soul is not the full Christian hope. It is true that after death an intermediate state is assumed to come until the day of final judgment. Christ assured the malefactor on the cross, who asked to be remembered when Jesus came into His Kingdom: "Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:43). In the period of waiting between physical death and the consummation of time, the spirits of men are not really asleep, or lost in unconsciousness. They do not cease to exist as material thought claims; but they await the fulfillment of ultimate liberty for the totality of human life in soul and body.

When the end of history comes, and at last death shall be destroyed as the final enemy (I Cor. 15:26), then man shall receive a new body. The bodies which have been as it were asleep shall be called forth (I Thess. 4:15), and then those "which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air" (I Thess. 4:17). The human bodies shall be changed from their mortal, "vile"

state to be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body (Phil. 3:21). The believer is not to be without a body. Paul has described the human attachment to the body, when he stated: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life" (II Cor. 5:1 ff). The new immortal body is not to be like the present body, raised in incorruption, glory and power; it is to be spiritual and not natural (I Cor. 15:43 ff). In other words, man is never finally to be a disembodied spirit, but soul and body. He may become like the angels, but he will never be a pure spirit. In this hope Christianity surpasses all paganism which regards the body as a prison house. While our present body will decay, breaking up in illness and disease, and while it will be dissolved in the earth into the elements of which it is composed, nevertheless we shall never function fully except through some body. Christianity does not despise bodily existence. It only promises a marvellous body like unto the glorified body of Christ. This body will be one of utter liberty and control by the spirit,

because it is spiritual. The limitations of matter will cease, but a wonderful free organism will be given man as the temple of his spirit. Even now the divine Spirit makes the bodies of believers temples of God (I Cor. 3:16).

One of the sad and disturbing ideas of original Christianity is the fact that all men for whom God appointed liberty will not attain it. Jesus clearly testifies to the destiny of eternal punishment (Mark 9:48; Matt. 22:13; 25:41). Unless it can be proved that these and like words are textually corrupt they must stand. No higher criticism has an inherent right to remove them from mere sentimentality, and influenced by the modern underestimation of sin and its consequences. According to Jesus there is also a certain sin committed in full consciousness, and in definite opposition to truth, combined with blasphemy. It is called the sin against the Holy Ghost (Matt. 12:31). In the Epistle to the Hebrews this definite rejection is characterized thus: "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame" (Heb. 6:4 ff). This awful sin is sometimes feared by anxious souls, but the very fear is proof that the transgression

has not been committed. History only shows one case, that of the Spaniard Spiero, who definitely felt himself guilty of this sin. The destiny of final punishment was never intended for men, but only for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25:41). It should not be painted in the lurid, imaginative colors of the Middle Ages. The figurative fire and worm ought not to be literalized. The fire is a symbol coming from the valley of Gehenna at Jerusalem where refuse was burnt. The worm means the decay as the body suffers it. The outer darkness and the cold are opposites to the light of love and the warmth of God's presence.

Men who drift toward an evil end mostly do so through the accumulation of sinful deeds. The conscience is gradually hardened and does not respond to the truth. When men deliberately and with full intent and knowledge refuse the light of truth they form the habit of indifference to every appeal of the right. Such a condition is not that of ignorant sin, nor of a weak succumbing under strong temptation, but a constantly increasing definite direction toward evil, and a determined reaction against any warning of the conscience. It is not so much the sins committed against men, as the clear rejection of God, and of Christ after He has been accepted freely, which bring condemnation. One of the dangers of all liberty is the power to go wrong. This is its risk. And as characters shape themselves into definite virtues or definite vices, there comes a time when

such a fixity of habit and attitude exists, that it is impossible to break it. The experience with criminals has shown this fact. There is no escape from the observation that men determine their destiny for good or evil, even if we make all allowance for heredity and environment. It is not possible for us, except in rare instances, to disentangle the skeins of any human life to the extent of passing judgment on the individual. We never know what extenuating cause may exist which God takes into consideration, but we must sustain the general principle, that, sad as it is, some men abuse their liberty and lose their final freedom. The moderns are afraid of this truth. A radical, J. Middleton Murry, has said, that "some of the most genuinely enlightened[7] are unconsciously afraid of Christianity."[8] The radical, who rejects Christianity, "might learn something about himself which he does not want to know."[9] "Worst of all, he might learn that there *is* salvation, and that there *is* damnation, and that these tremendous words express not idle and superstitious fancies, but verities of human life which lie open to the knowledge of any man with the courage to look at the facts of his own experience."[10] It is true that Mr. Murry does not extend this fact into the future, because he rejects all supernatural realities. The principle, which

[7] We would say materialists.
[8] "God," p. 255.
[9] "God," p. 255.
[10] "God," p. 255.

he annunciates, is, however, extensible into the hereafter as soon as we believe in eternity.

The modernistic attitude is stated by H. Wildon Carr thus: "Two articles of the Christian belief which were universally accepted in the middle of the last century have been dropped out of the Christian doctrine which is preached to-day,—the doctrine of everlasting punishment, and the belief in the personality of Satan as the omnipresent tempter. Both of these doctrines were, up to a very recent time, universally accepted as an integral and authoritative part of the Christian religion. They have not yielded to attack, they have been dropped for lack of defenders. The reason is not that they are logically assailable but that they are morally indefensible."[11] The truth is that the modernistic denial weakens the moral strength of man, and denies the consequences of sin in man's ultimate destiny. It also debases God's holiness, makes His love sentimental, and has no probable explanation for the origin of evil. The testimony of Christ, which is not doubtful textually, is simply set aside through a negative criticism based altogether on the degradation of the moral sense as it refers to sin and its ultimate outcome.

The ultimate joy in heaven is described in many ways in the New Testament. There is an exceeding and eternal weight of glory (II Cor.

[11] "The Unique Status of Man," p. 142.

4:17), which shall be revealed in us (Rom. 8:18). But with all the possible figures of rest, of pearly gates, of golden streets, of walls of gems, and all like symbolical terms, we must remember that: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him" (I Cor. 2:9). But we do know that if our deeds of love done in all humility, and without hope of reward, or consciousness that we are having any claim on Christ, are acknowledged before the eternal throne (Matt. 25:40 ff) we shall be among the saints that will judge and rule the world (I Cor. 6:2 cf; Matt. 5:5).

There will also be a new social order which will begin with the visible return of Christ (Acts 1:11). This hope animated the apostolic church (Phil. 4:5). It passed away because men attached conditions of time to it, although Jesus distinctly disavowed that the day or hour could be known (Matt. 24:36). At the same time He spoke very definitely of His return in a manner that does not permit this return to be spiritualized through the coming of the Holy Ghost, or the increasing advent of the Kingdom (Matt. 24:27). When the Christ comes there will be a new heaven and a new earth (Rev. 21:10). The new Jerusalem (Rev. 21:2) typifies the redeemed city of God. In it there will be no need of light, as God is present with the Lamb (Rev. 21:22, 23). This Church Triumphant in the new society will

require no temple (Rev. 21:22), for God will be the tabernacle (Rev. 21:3). The Kingdom will be established forever as the fellowship of the eternally and unceasingly liberated saints, rejoicing without end in the liberty of the children of God.

2 34
H 11

BV 741
Haas,
1862-
The Ch
em,
rty

DATE DUE

Haas, John Au The Christian way of liber
3 0645 0005 0001 3